

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLIII

SEPTEMBER, 1945

NO. 993

Democracy and the Party System

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON

*Reprinted from The MONTH**

THERE is a striking contrast between the immense importance of the question of party for the future of the world and the comparative apathy of public opinion with regard to the principles involved.

Today all over Europe men are suffering and dying and being outlawed and liquidated for their membership or non-membership in a political party. Party has largely taken the place that religion took in the past. The persecutors and the persecuted are no longer men of religious faith, members of churches and sects, but men of political ideology, wearers of a party badge and shouters of a political slogan. We have seen the danger that this tendency may swallow up everything else, humanity and patriotism and reason, until the whole

order of civilized life collapses in barbarism.

On the other hand it is so easy to see the enormous evils produced by the spirit of party. The party system has always had such a bad press, that there is a danger of going too far in the opposite direction and forgetting that without some kind of party system democratic government becomes almost impossible. And not democratic government alone—for party is equally characteristic of the older type of aristocratic state and of the new type of totalitarian democracy. Indeed today only a few rare survivors of the older style of non-party state exist in the most remote parts of Asia.

No doubt it is theoretically possible to conceive a democracy without parties, after the fashion of the old Swiss

* 114 Mount St., London, W.1, March-April, 1945

democracy of the original Forest Cantons. But this is so remote from practical politics that we can afford to ignore it. The size and power and complicated mechanism of the modern state demand an equally high standard of political organization, and this involves in practice not only a highly organized civil service but also a highly organized party system. The real issue is, therefore, not that of party or no party, but that of the totalitarian versus the non-totalitarian party, or the single party versus the multiple party system. And these questions are very important and very urgent. In fact, all our political institutions and perhaps even our very national existence depend on whether it is possible to maintain the non-totalitarian party system under modern conditions.

MONOPOLY OF POLITICAL POWER

At first sight this may seem a surprising statement, for one might suppose that if party is inevitable, a single party would fulfil its function more economically and more efficiently than a number of rival parties which must inevitably cause political and social conflict. But if we consider the implications of a single party we shall soon see that much more is at stake than a mere question of relative efficiency.

A single party means a monopoly of political power. It means that no change of government or policy is possible except by the will of the party

that already controls the government or is controlled by it. It means that no organized criticism of the government is possible and that the rights of individuals or cooperatives or private associations are all dependent on this single center of power. The fact is that the single party presupposes an entirely different political ideal and an entirely different type of state from that involved in the free or multiple party system. It may be a democratic state if we understand democracy in Rousseau's sense of a state in which the General Will is supreme, but it is a different form of democracy from that which has been developed in this country and in America as a result of the toleration and even encouragement of the opinions and interests of minorities—so different, indeed, that the use of the same term for the two political traditions is equivocal and misleading.

The single party state, whether it embodies the will of the people or the usurped authority of some minority, belongs to the same political genus as the absolute monarchy. It is absolutism in modern dress and as a rule this is made perfectly obvious by the fact that the single party state is almost invariably a dictatorship.

On the other hand all those states which admit the existence of more than one party belong to the same political genus, whether they are democratic or non-democratic in regard to the franchise and to the control

of the executive by the elected representatives of the people.

This is not merely a question of the political structure of the state, but it also affects its social form and its spiritual character. If a state admits the existence of constitutional opposition to the government, it also tends almost inevitably to encourage freedom of discussion and the free expression of opinion, even where, as in 18th century England, the opposition itself formed part of a privileged minority. Actually the type of democracy which developed in Britain and America, as well as many of the smaller countries of Western Europe, has been based not on the solidarity of the general will, but on the rights of minorities, the freedom of minority opinion and the existence of a constitutional opposition. These are the hallmarks of the particular type of state which was developed in this country and in America from the 18th century onwards, and when the English-speaking peoples talk of democracy or the democratic way of life or the Four Freedoms, they are thinking primarily and perhaps exclusively of this kind of state.

In a democracy of this kind the party system plays an essential role, for it is the function of party to organize political opinion in such a way as to have a direct and effective influence on the conduct of government. It does this in two ways—first by providing an organ of opposition which

subjects the government to a continuous process of examination and criticism, and secondly by building up an alternative government which will take over the reins of power as soon as it has rallied a sufficient majority of the electorate to its support. These functions can be fulfilled most adequately and economically when there are only two parties, and in fact we find in the countries where this type of democracy has been developed—in Britain and America—that there has always been a tendency towards a two-party system. But this does not exclude considerable diversities within the party. In fact in this country, the two-party system has developed on the lines of two rival coalitions of political groups rather than as two highly organized ideological units.

Indeed, it may be argued that the ideological factor has been only of secondary importance in the Anglo-American party system, so that the two great American parties have been described as empty bottles into which any wine could be poured so long as the labels were not changed. This is actually desirable inasmuch as the more fluid the party line, the more capable it is of receiving the changing currents of public opinion. A strictly ideological party is a strait waistcoat which forces public opinion into its own pattern. Hence, it is better in principle that the ideological group should be distinct from the political party. In fact the former has usually

been most effective when it had no direct political responsibilities, as in the case of the Fabian Society or the Philosophic Radicals, whereas the Doctrinaires in early 19th century France forfeited much of the influence they might have exercised by their premature acquisition of political power.

NO CLASS BASIS

In the same way, the democratic party should not have a class basis, for this also tends to make party division too rigid and their opposition too extreme. If the parties really represent different social classes, every election becomes a kind of class war, and the changes of government which should be normal incidents of democratic politics acquire a quasi-revolutionary character. For the parliamentary party is not a communal unit like the totalitarian party; it is a political mechanism to ensure the free expression of public opinion and the even distribution of political power. It is essentially a limited and subordinate organization, and the moment that it oversteps its limit and aspires to become a complete and self-sufficient social unit, it defeats the purpose for which it exists.

This limitation of the function of party is obviously a difficult condition which is only possible in a society which possesses considerable political experience and a tradition of social unity and cooperation. Where these

conditions do not exist, parliamentary democracy has proved incapable of maintaining itself against the single party state, which is its most formidable rival.

This is the crucial political issue of our time, but though it has assumed a new form, it has a long history behind it. In fact the first democratic state to make its appearance in modern times, was not a democracy of the true parliamentary type. It was the single party dictatorship of the First French Republic—a régime which in spite of its short existence had a profound effect on European history and on modern political thought. During its brief career the Jacobin republic developed all the characteristic features which have become so familiar in the totalitarian states of our own times; the party ideology and the party slogan, the party purge (*épuration*), the liquidation of opposite groups, the use of intimidation and terror as political weapons and the exclusion from political rights of classes and individuals that were regarded as socially or ideologically unreliable.

Above all, it developed the technique by which a minority which claimed to represent the general will imposed itself on the majority by an organized system of propaganda and the formation of an artificial public opinion by the suppression of all opposition views. Naturally enough this system provoked the most intense hostility not only from the supporters of

the old régime but from the liberals who had been the dominant element in the Constituent Assembly. What is more remarkable is that they did not underestimate its possibilities. Its bitterest opponents, like Burke and Mallet du Pan and de Maistre, were the first to recognize the immense increase of energy and power produced by the concentration of all the reserves of society in the solid mass of a democratic single party state: a battering ram with twenty million wills behind it, in de Maistre's expressive phrase.

The tradition of the Jacobin republic survived in two different forms. On the one hand it produced the plebiscitary dictatorship of Napoleon and the 19th century ideal of democratic imperialism. On the other, the memory of the French Revolution survived in the underground world of the revolutionary agitators and idealists—in groups like the Society of the Equals, the Carbonari, the Society of the Rights of Man and the League of the Just. Here it became a cult and a legend and inspired not only the republican parties but also the earliest socialist movements in France and Germany. With men like Buonarotti and Blanque and later with Bakunin, and even to some extent with Proudhon and Marx, revolution became an end in itself, a creative act which would give birth to a new world in blood and fire. To such men the Anglo-American tradition of constitutionalism and legal rights was su-

premely distasteful, and the pattern of democratic action was found not in parliamentarism but in the Parisian Commune of 1871 which in its turn, like the Commune of 1793, became a legend and an ideal.

Now it is obvious that revolutionary democracy of this type must necessarily assume a totalitarian character. Revolution is social war: it leaves no time for discussion and no room for party division within the revolutionary ranks. It demands fanaticism, discipline and unity of direction. And even if the revolution is successful it will be necessary to maintain this unity of direction, whether in the form of a personal dictatorship or the class dictatorship of the proletariat, until the new social system is completely established. But though the revolutionary democrats were totalitarian, they were no friends of the state. "We deny the government of the state," wrote Proudhon, "because we affirm the personality and the autonomy of the masses"—and this attitude is characteristic in varying degrees of all the social revolutionaries of the 19th century, from Bakunin, who said that he had two *bêtes noires*—the State and the Church—to Marx and Engels who believed that the State would automatically "wither away" in proportion as the new socialist order was realized.

Meanwhile, however, parliamentary democracy was going from strength to strength until by the be-

ginning of the present century it seemed destined to become universally accepted as the only normal form of government in modern states. But it was less firmly established than it seemed, and the moment of its apparent triumph, when the Western democracies defeated the military powers of Central Europe and established the League of Nations, actually marked the turn of the tide. From that time the single party state has steadily grown in importance, if not in popularity, and parliamentary democracy has steadily declined. The tendency is closely associated with the rise of Fascism with which it is often identified. But it is in fact a much wider movement. It found its first and most far-reaching expression in Communist Russia where it was based on a strictly Marxian ideology interpreted by a great political realist, and it has also deeply influenced the national movements in the Near and Far East which are neither Fascist nor Communist.

DISINTEGRATION

No doubt a great deal of this advance of the single party state is to be explained by the sudden conversion to democratic and nationalist ideals of peoples which have been accustomed for ages to autocratic forms of government, for as I remarked in the beginning, the single party state is a kind of democratic absolutism. But this is not the whole explanation,

since parliamentary democracy has also lost ground in the West, even in countries which had considerable experience of representative institutions. To some extent this has been due to infection from outside by totalitarian propaganda, but this could hardly have been successful had there not been elements of disintegration already present in Western democracy. On the one hand the Marxian criticism of parliamentary democracy as a hollow facade to mask the class domination of the bourgeoisie alienated the sympathies of the workers and the socialist parties, while on the other hand the leaders of Western culture became increasingly sceptical of the moral values and the rational principles which had originally been the common ground that united all the democratic parties.

These tendencies to disintegration were increased by the introduction of proportional representation and the multiplication of minority groups which reduced the art of democratic government to a complicated manipulation of shifting coalitions. We have seen how the totalitarian parties were able to exploit this situation so as to make democratic government impossible, and finally to solve the deadlock they had created by a plebiscitary appeal to the will of the people, backed by the violence of an armed minority. At the present time, though the direct threat to Western democracy by the Fascist parties has

been defeated, the situation of parliamentary democracy on the continent of Europe remains extremely precarious. We see on the one hand numerous but weak democratic parties attempting to recover their former constitutional leadership, and on the other powerful armed groups which seek to impose their will on the nation by revolutionary violence. Such a situation is only too favorable to the development of new forms of totalitarianism and dictatorship. In any case it is not possible to combine the two types of party in a single state, any more than you can keep rabbits and ferrets in the same cage.

FREEDOM FROM FEAR

The first condition for any kind of parliamentary democracy is that Freedom from Fear which President Roosevelt once declared to be one of the essential bases of world order. So long as men are liable to be shot for their opinions, so long as minority groups are liable to be decimated or deported, there can be no room for free discussion or free political institutions. But without these things Western democracy loses its character and its distinctive values, since there is as wide a gulf between the two rival forms of democracy as there can be between any two political systems whatsoever. The experience of the last thirty years has shown how difficult it is to introduce parliamentary institutions into countries which have

no traditions of political freedom. It is impossible to maintain the right of political opposition where this right is only understood in terms of civil war. The parliamentary party system involves the toleration of our opponents, as well as freedom to express our own views. For the parties are necessary to one another as complementary organs of the democratic state, instead of being the exclusive embodiment of that state as in the totalitarian system.

But though we now realize that the tradition of freedom and material toleration is a much rarer and more delicate plant than we believed in the past, nothing in the experience of the last thirty years has diminished its inherent value and importance, and nothing can excuse the blind and cynical indifference which gambles away the greatest political inheritance in the world in the vain attempt to appease totalitarian opinion either in this country or elsewhere.

In order to preserve this tradition of political freedom it is not enough to pay lip service to vague ideals of Democracy and Equality and Liberty, which have completely different and even contradictory meanings in the two types of state. We must make it perfectly clear to the man in the street what we are fighting for and what are the minimal conditions under which parliamentary democracy can exist. On the one hand it is necessary to preserve the freedom of opinion and the

constitutional rights of minorities; but on the other, it is even more important to maintain the self-imposed discipline of civil society which is the foundation alike of Western democracy and of our traditional Western culture.

For the most fundamental political alternative is that between the state which is conceived as a scientific power organization and the state which is the embodiment of a common law founded on the will and the conscience of the individual citizen. The single party system inevitably favors the former, while parliamentary democracy can never be permanently successful except in a state of the second type. But such a state cannot be created by majority decision or by the fiat of political power. It rests on foundations that are beyond politics, principles of the moral order and the forces of spiritual tradition. The restoration of these foundations is the greatest problem of modern civilization, but it is a spiritual problem that can only be solved by spiritual means. But if this task is beyond the powers and outside the province of the political leader, it is at least his duty to recognize the importance of spiritual values, and to do nothing to weaken the foundations on which the stability of his own work depends.

As the Christian state of the Middle Ages demanded the limitation of the king by law, and the independence of the spiritual power of which he was the servant rather than the master, so the Western tradition of democracy involves the self-limitation of governments and parties and majorities under the rule of law and the recognition of a super-political order which has its autonomous values that may not be disregarded or overridden for any political end. No doubt in practice the state will sacrifice anything when its survival is at stake in time of war and revolution, and for that reason the world has always been full of despotism and servitude, but it has been the ideal of Western civilization to push back the frontiers of necessity and to widen the sphere of freedom, so that the state is not merely a necessary evil, a guarantee of bare existence, but a society for realizing a good life.

The Western parliamentary democracy has been the last and most elaborate expression of this ideal. The question that we now have to face is whether this highly developed type of state can be maintained and extended or whether it is destined to succumb to a coarser but stronger power, as the Greek city state succumbed to Macedonian military despotism.



"Let men be good and the government cannot be bad."—
William Penn.

Understanding Russia

SIMEON STRUNSKY in *Topics of the Times*

*Reprinted from the NEW YORK TIMES**

SINCE it is permissible to introduce grave matters lightly, there is the story of the little boy who was told to stop pulling the cat's tail. He insisted that he was doing nothing of the kind. All he did was to hold on to the cat's tail and the cat did the pulling. That is virtually the explanation which you hear on every side here at home for the present tense state of Soviet-American feeling. Soviet Russia can be accused of nothing more than holding on to the cat's tail. It is we who have created the unfortunate state of tension by pulling in what we consider the right direction.

In every case of Russo-American misunderstanding, it is the assumption, in quarters mentioned above, that we are always at fault. We ignorantly or perversely fail to understand the Russians and their use of language. The thought is never suggested that the Russians and their use of language may be hard to understand for us, and sometimes impossible to understand.

Take a plain everyday word like "coalition." A writer in *Izvestia* says that China's great need is "a coalition government dedicated to democracy." To realize that aim only two steps are necessary. First there must be a national assembly in which all parties are represented. After this must come "the removal of the reactionaries who now head the Kuomintang, the Chinese government party."

In other words, coalition as used in *Izvestia* means the elimination of the people *Izvestia* doesn't like. Compromise means a purge of one's opponents. If there is in the United States and other English-speaking parts of the world a gross misunderstanding of *Izvestia's* stand on coalition and compromise, it is because the English-speaking nations maliciously twist the meaning of these words, or are just plain dumb.

Take the word "disunited." A writer in *Pravda* speaks bitterly about the return of Daladier, Reynaud and other pre-war French leaders from captivity and their reappearance on the political stage. *Pravda* is scandalized by the antics of these "political corpses." They are the men "who led a disunited France into war."

* 229 W. 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y., June 6, 1945

Why was France disunited in 1939? Because there were monarchists and fascists who hated the Third Republic? Yes. But there were other enemies of the Third Republic in 1939. They were the Communists, and not only at the beginning of the war. They remained "disunited" for nearly two years after the outbreak of the war, until June 22, 1941, when Hitler attacked Soviet Russia.

In our Magazine, some time after that epochal date, an article on the work of the French underground, later known as the Resistance, emphasized the leading role played by the Communists in the campaign against the German masters. One reason, said the admiring if somewhat naive author, was that Communists were ever so much better organized than the rest of the underground. They had retained the conspirative machinery which they had employed against the French Government up to the moment Hitler attacked Soviet Russia.

So here again the American people is in danger of misunderstanding a common word like "disunited" as used, realistically, in the Soviet press. When a French monarchist hates and combats a venal plutocratic republic, he disunites it. When a French Communist hates and assails a bourgeois capitalistic republic, he is doing something very different; he is presumably unifying the nation.

What has happened to a word much more important than coalition or disunion, what has happened to the word "democracy" in Soviet usage, needs no detailed description by now. In the Soviet press democracy is now the favorite word. By democracy *Izvestia* and *Pravda* mean coalition governments based on one party. They mean national unity based on "Marxist-Leninist" principles. They mean a democracy based on controlled voting, controlled printing, controlled reading, and the rest.

Nothing can be simpler, and if the English-speaking public fails to understand, it must be because Anglo-Americans are out for trouble. Whatever is the right word for it, the principle of the thing is plain enough. In all misunderstandings between the English-speaking powers and Soviet Russia the fault is unilateral—it is always the fault of the Anglo-Americans.

The argument for a wider study of the Russian language in this country as a contribution to permanent friendship with Russia is unanswerable. But the trouble is not always, nor primarily, with the Russian language. It is with the Soviet use of familiar English words like coalition, disunion, democracy.

Parenthood That is Planned

FRANCES M. MARKEY

PARENTHOOD is a vocation based on a sacramental contract which we call marriage. Married people are called, just as priests and nuns are called. The latter are called to share in a special way in the redemptive work of Christ. The former are called to share not only in the redemption but also in the work of creation. They are co-creators with God. That is why the hardships of childbearing are light, the constant care of infant days a task of honor and dignity, the steady guidance through youthful years a privilege. Father and mother are fashioning immortal souls to adore and praise before the throne of God forever and ever and ever.

Just as the nun fulfils the purpose of her vocation within the framework of her vows, so do married people live out their vocation within the marriage contract. Whatever violates the contract defeats the purpose of the vocation and thwarts God's Law. That is why such things as divorce, abortion and birth-control are wrong and none of the arguments for planned parenthood or the like can make them right. The Church teaches that these things are wrong, but they are wrong because they violate God's Law. They violate the marriage contract.

Since marriage is a contract by

*An address delivered at the
Forum of the Family of Notre
Dame College Alumnae, Staten Is-
land, N. Y. May, 1945.*

which husband and wife, in mutual love, agree to the procreation and education of children, it can be said that the family is a cooperative organization. There are duties and responsibilities for all. If the family is to be a success, the work of the members must be planned. This is one type of planned parenthood which is good, the kind which makes of the family a really cooperative unit.

Parents contribute to the success of this cooperative adventure in many ways. They contribute by training the child in its very early years—in its prayers and pre-school responsibilities. The school is the complement to the home. It can only continue what the home has begun. The school will do the most good when parents uphold the teacher's authority.

Parents contribute to this cooperative organization by treating all their children alike. Favoritism creates a dislike in the children for one another.

Parents contribute to the family

happiness by developing to the full the child's personality and God-given talents; not by trying to make the child like him or herself.

Parents contribute to family happiness in their understanding of each other at all times. They should know when to hold back that word. They must uphold one another in the discipline of the children.

Parents contribute by disciplining with love and not through anger. If the father is a domineering person, or the mother a selfish, demanding person, the family becomes unbalanced and the development of the child suffers. The breakup of family unity is the beginning of the breakup of the nation; for, as the home goes, so goes the nation. We have seen this in France, to say nothing of our country where divorce is alarmingly prevalent.

Parents contribute to family unity by being companions to their children. The only way we can know our children is to be with them, sharing the interests that are theirs. We must welcome their friends and listen tolerantly to the child's point of view.

Parents contribute to this family unity by showing the child its responsibilities and that it is expected to contribute to the family happiness no matter what its age.

SELF CONTROL

A young lieutenant I know made a splendid record for self-control and

mastery over his emotions both at school and in the army. He was not always the master. I remember a time when, at the age of six, he set himself to build a table. Things went wrong, so he flew into a rage. He smashed the table to pieces. When he had cooled down a bit, his parents took him aside. They showed him how, in order to get along in life, he must always have himself under control. When things were harder, the control must be stronger. A few nights later his parents came home to find a little table with a note attached: "I made it." Young ones are never too young to learn how to control themselves.

The lieutenant has a brother, an ensign in the navy. He is an engaging, cheerful personality, and he contributes mightily to the family humor and fun. But as a youngster he was sullen and grouchy. A little "planned parenthood" of the right kind was brought to bear upon this problem. Every morning when he came to breakfast with a long face, he was sent upstairs to get it shortened a bit. He soon realized that he was missing something of the family life. He wanted to be in on the breakfasts. All he needed for admittance was a sunny smile, which soon became habitual with him.

The brothers have an older sister. When she was little, she was the biggest of the three and so she got all the new underwear. The brothers got the hand-me-downs. This accidental dis-

1943
tinct
and
unse
tribu
train
E
chil
incr
one
this
goin
mur
of t
of t
with
Hol
grev
was
and
a S
son
rail
I
cust
unio
Thi
fath
we
to t
fait
que
ing
and
pan
7
mu
ther
had

tion made her pretty important and selfish. The fact that she is now unselfish (if still important) is a tribute to her parents' wise plan of training.

Every mother knows that, when children reach the party age, worries increase. There is late drinking, for one thing. One family I know solved this problem by forming the custom of going to Sunday Mass and Communion together. From the morning of their First Communion, each child of this family went to Communion with the others every Sunday and Holy Day of Obligation. When they grew to be of party age, this custom was continued as a matter of course and none of them ever thought that a Saturday night party was any reason for keeping away from the altar rail the following morning.

In our own family we have this custom and another which I think is unique. We have family conferences. This was the idea of the children's father. When they were very young, we would call them together and talk to them, first, on the importance of faith and prayer, the practice of frequent prayer and a continued thanking of God for all good things, big and small—for their home, their companions and for one another.

They were never lectured on how much their parents had sacrificed for them. They were told how much they had improved through the years, with

specific cases cited for each. We went back over little instances, remembering things they had done and laughing over them with them. As they grew older these conferences were held three times a year: New Year's Day, to start things off right; at Easter, the time of rejoicing; and in the Fall before they went back to school. At each conference we stressed the importance of frequent prayer and explained why we placed so much emphasis on weekly family Communion. It is the best bulwark, for parents as well as children, against the evils of the world. The habit has both natural and supernatural rewards.

The purpose of the conference in the Fall was to make the children aware of their responsibilities now that they were going to face life, even in a little way, without the council of their parents. They would have to make up their own minds in the face of temptation. They would have to decide for themselves whether they would follow the teaching of their parents or take their chances with the pitfalls.

The youngest member of the family, many years the junior of the others, was always included in these conferences and her little problems were taken up with the others.

This *briefing*, or this taking the children into our confidence and placing confidence in them, gave them the strength, along with God's grace, to

defeat the average temptation which might have led them astray.

During their school years they were told that first places in class standing were not too important. What was important was their being able to say, honestly, that they had done their best.

Parenthood that is planned in this way can help the Catholic family lead its life to the full. The child is formed not only as an individual but also as a member of the family and of the nation. This kind of planned parenthood is a bulwark against juvenile delinquency, which is only another word for parental delinquency. It is the families in which parenthood was planned in this Catholic way which contributed soldiers to our armed forces in both World Wars in numbers out of all proportion to the Catholic population.

THE JOY OF FAMILY LIFE

Advocates of *planned parenthood* stress the sacrifices of family life. I would like to stress some of the joys of a Catholic parenthood which was planned.

A little girl of four showed a talent for music. Her parents saw this and gave her every advantage possible. Her mother took her to the children's concerts every Saturday morning, fostering this talent, explaining to her that with the talent God gives a corresponding responsibility, that she should always remember to share her

talent with other people, playing for them when they requested it.

Her father sat beside her when she practised. When she made a mistake, he put a match on the piano. When the mistake was corrected, the match was taken away.

When this girl was fifteen, her parents came to breakfast Easter morning to find an invitation at their places. She would like to give a concert for them and for their friends. Thirty people, including the parish priest, listened to that concert. Do you not agree that this child showed an appreciation and understanding of her home? For her parents it was one of the joys of a parenthood that was planned.

Another came to them in the form of a letter on the 21st birthday of a son:

Dear Mother and Dad:

Attaining the age of twenty-one is no different from any other birthday, but it did make me come to a deeper realization of what an enviable pedestal you two have built under me during these twenty-one years. You have sacrificed and put your lives and souls into equipping me mentally, spiritually and morally for the life I have to lead.

I do not feel it is a duty that I owe you to cherish this sound equipment. It is more than that. A duty is a task that can be done and thus finished. What I feel in gratitude is more like an infinite goal, something beyond reach. I hope I will never waver in my desire to nourish the roots you have planted, so that I may some day feel that I have done my best

to help weave our family into a solid unit.

Thank you again for your extreme generosity to me and for your heart-felt devotion.

Another letter from the same boy, wounded in France and writing from a hospital in England, showed that the joys of a parenthood planned along Catholic lines can stand the acid test of war.

Without getting too sentimental or optimistic, I do hope beyond all else that I will be home again soon, so that I can begin to show you my gratitude for all that you have done for me these twenty-three odd years. This I mean very sincerely, for anxious as I am to enjoy the

luxury and warmth of our home again, I can endure these hardships when I realize how trivial they are compared to what Christ went through at this very time (Holy Week) for us. So it is with the joy one feels from sacrificing something—though it be not even of one's choosing—that I go back to war again; and with a very deep gratitude to you, Mother and Dad, for endowing me with what gives me this inward joy, for this feeling of self-sacrifice, slight though it may be.

The challenge today is to the Catholic home. Home life has broken down all around us. Are we holding? Only the real Catholic parent, building and fostering the real Catholic home, can answer.



A Prophecy

Communism is not only a creed, it is a plan of campaign. A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill-book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions.

No faith need be, indeed, may be, kept with non-Communists. Every act of good-will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or States is to be utilized for their ruin. Then when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence, from revolt to private assassination, must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions, must be extinguished by death. Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterwards broken.—*Winston Churchill in 1937.*

Ethical Aspects of the Tariff

MONSIGNOR JOHN A. RYAN, D.D.

THE general principles of ethics which govern economic intercourse between States are the same as those which apply to other international relations. They are identical with the ethical principles that govern the relations between different groups of persons within the same country. As a rule, actions which are wrong when performed by one domestic corporation in relation to another are likewise immoral when perpetrated by one State against another State. In their economic attitudes toward and dealings with one another, nations are bound by the precepts of charity, justice, veracity, and all the other virtues which are binding upon neighbors.

One of the greatest economic evils in our international life is the maintenance of high tariffs on imports. This policy has been greatly expanded and intensified since the Great War and shows as yet no definitely hopeful signs of discontinuance. As a general consequence, practically all the countries of the world, particularly those of Europe, have rendered themselves poorer and have made life harder for their people.

The process by which these deplorable evils are brought about is easily understood by anyone who takes the trouble to exercise slightly his powers

This article originally appeared in AMERICA, May 6, 1933. Because of its pertinence at the present time, it is being reprinted here.

of analysis. In the vast majority of instances, a protective tariff increases to all the domestic consumers the cost of the goods upon which it is levied. While some domestic labor obtains employment in making some goods that had previously been imported, other domestic labor which had formerly been employed in producing goods for export is thrown out of employment. The latter consequence is inevitable, since the foreigners are unable to buy as much as they formerly bought from the country which has imposed the new or the higher protective tariffs. The reason why they must diminish their purchases from the protective-tariff country is that they are unable to sell to the latter as large a product as they formerly sold. In general and over any considerable period of time, say five years, a country pays for imports only by means of exports. When exports are diminished through foreign tariffs, imports must likewise diminish.

In the country that imposes the tariff what happens is substantially

this: Some of its labor is now employed in making goods that it cannot produce as easily as can the foreigners or as cheaply as it could purchase them from a foreign country; instead of producing goods for export which it could turn out cheaper than the foreigners, it must assign a portion of its labor to less profitable production. The net result is an uneconomic use, a waste of labor power and natural resources, which is translated into higher prices to the consumers.

In this situation, a protective tariff is unjust both to the people of the country that imposes it and to the nations whose goods are subjected to the import tax. Life is made harder for both. When a foreign country retaliates by imposing tariffs upon commodities which it could buy more cheaply from the country that began the tariff policy, the hardship and injustice to both countries is necessarily increased; and the greater the number of countries that adopt this disastrous tariff competition, the greater is the injury inflicted upon all of them and the more intensive and extensive is the moral wrong.

It may be plausibly objected that the foregoing picture is too simple and too hypothetical—too reminiscent of the abstract reasoning of the Classical economists. So far as I can see, there are five situations which may reasonably be submitted as qualifying the factual description and the ethical judgment.

The first involves what is known as the "infant-industry" argument. Here is a country whose resources both of materials and labor are such that a protective tariff will bring about the establishment of new industries which in a few years can produce goods more cheaply than they can be bought from foreigners. Without the tariff and the resulting higher prices obtained for the product during the period of "infancy," the new industry would not be able to survive or get a foothold; but these very high initial prices will be more than offset by the low prices at which the industry will be able to sell goods for an indefinite period afterward.

BENEFITS FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Undoubtedly this process has been exemplified in more than one industry and in more than one country. The underlying theory constituted the basis upon which the protective-tariff policy was adopted in the United States. So long as this condition persists in connection with any industry, a tariff is neither economically nor morally injurious to the inhabitants of the home country. While it causes some temporary economic inconvenience to the foreigners whose goods are shut out, it cannot be set down as an act of injustice or even uncharity to them unless in very exceptional circumstances. Moreover, the addition to the world's wealth which results from the establishment of a new and self-

sustaining industry would, in a rational system of international intercourse, diffuse its benefits to many foreign countries.

It is very doubtful that many of the countries of Europe which have participated in the destructive tariff competition since the War have the capacity to develop new industries which will ever be capable of underselling the goods that they had previously imported. Hence, the infant-industry consideration is only slightly, if at all, available to modify the judgment of injustice and uncharity which has been pronounced above. As regards the United States, we have no more infant industries to be developed, or, if there be any such which are still latent, they could be set on their feet much more economically and fairly by a system of direct bounties than by protective tariffs. Our existing industries have all passed beyond the stage of infancy. Most of them do not need the stimulus of protective tariff, while the minority will, for various reasons, never be able to stand on their own feet. In neither case, therefore, is the protective tariff justified by the infant-industry argument. From this point of view, our tariff system is subject to the same ethical condemnation as the tariff systems of Europe.

The second qualification is urged on behalf of a country which is unable to produce, or to sell, sufficient exports to pay for the goods that it would like to import. Take a country

which is so poor in natural resources or in economic capacity that everything or almost everything which it is able to produce can be bought more cheaply from abroad. The people of that country are faced with two alternatives: either to levy a protective tariff on all imports and become a self-sufficient nation on a low standard of living, or to have recourse to wholesale emigration. For many reasons, the latter alternative is not feasible. Hence, such a country is ethically justified in maintaining protective tariffs. So far as I know, very few countries are in this deplorable condition.

Consider, however, a country which can produce sufficient exports to pay for all its needed imports but is unable to find a market for a sufficient quantity of the former, owing to competition with other countries that are likewise producing too much of these staple goods. Such seems to be the position of Great Britain at the present time. Aside from a considerable movement of emigration, which is scarcely practicable, the only adequate recourse for Great Britain is to produce at home all or a considerable portion of certain goods, specifically foodstuffs, which it has hitherto imported. This policy can be made effective only through a protective tariff or a system of bounties. Obviously, the policy would be entirely in accord with the principles of morality. No such justification can be offered for

protective tariffs in the United States.

The third reason that may plausibly be urged to justify a tariff policy is the social benefits to be derived from a diversified system of industry. The citizens of a country should have the widest possible choice of occupations. The economic activities of a country should not be almost entirely agricultural nor almost entirely manufacturing. There is considerable force in this contention, as applied to a country where the dominant condition is industry, but it has very little merit in a country where the people are mainly farmers. In modern times all the essential advantages of civilized life can be provided in a dominantly agricultural economy. In general, it may be safely asserted that this argument for tariff duties is of doubtful agency from the side of either economics or ethics. It is, of course, not pertinent to the United States.

ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

The fourth argument for a tariff is the supposed desirability of national economic independence. A country which does not produce foodstuffs adequate to the needs of its population will be in danger of starvation and vanquishment from an enemy blockade. This argument seems to prove too much. A nation that has not a sufficient military and naval equipment to defend itself against every probable belligerent combination can be conquered whether or not it is able

to provide itself with the necessities of life. Economic self-sufficiency will merely enable the attacked nation to ward off conquest a little longer. The great majority of countries cannot afford, nor have they attempted, to provide for themselves this complete military security. Neither is it rational for them to aim at a relative and temporary economic security through tariffs which inflict economic hardship upon both themselves and foreigners. As regards the more powerful nations, they have already achieved all that is profitably possible in the field of economic independence. Hence, they are not justified in enacting a tariff policy for that purpose.

In our time, there is a particular reason why no nation is justified in seeking national economic independence as a protection in war. This is the ugly thing which the Holy Father calls "exaggerated nationalism." This doctrine and this attitude of national mind are both unjust and uncharitable to foreign nations. In almost all countries where national economic independence is systematically sought, this immoral attitude, this exaggerated nationalism, is more or less deliberately cultivated and increased. An obvious consequence is the augmented danger of war. In our time war is such a disastrous contingency that no nation is justified in pursuing any policy which increases its likelihood unless that policy is necessary for legitimate self-defense.

One phase of the economic-independence doctrine which strongly fosters an immoral nationalism is the recently invented propaganda for purchasing only domestic goods. "Buy British" and "Buy American" are two conspicuous instances. This appeal not only contributes to exaggerated nationalism but is economically stupid, since it would require a people to pay more for goods than is necessary and at the same time destroy their export trade. If we do not buy from foreigners, they will not have the means to pay for the goods which we want to sell to them. It is both economically and ethically indefensible.

A CONSPICUOUS EXAMPLE

The final qualification of the proposition that protective tariffs are generally immoral relates to the method of getting rid of them. Numerous and important industries in many countries which have been established by the aid of tariffs, would suffer greatly or even disappear entirely if this protection were suddenly and completely withdrawn. In such cases, equity demands that tariff removal be gradual. Indeed, some of the protected industries would be unable to survive even a gradual process. Some of them provide employment and livelihood for many thousands of persons.

In the United States, the most conspicuous example is the sugar industry. If the tariff were withdrawn the producers of cane- and beet-sugar

crops, as well as those engaged in the manufacture and refining, would be compelled to seek occupation and livelihood elsewhere. Probably this would be the case even if the process of abolition covered a long period of years. Can all the people of the United States then be reasonably required to pay higher prices for sugar in order to keep in existence this uneconomical industry which provides employment for an extremely small minority of the population? The fairest solution would be to pay a direct bounty to the sugar growers equal to the advantage that they now get from the tariff duties, but to deny the bounty to any increases in either beet or cane sugar production. The cost of the bounty to the taxpayers would be very much less than the cost inflicted by the tariff on the consumers of sugar. Incidentally, this arrangement would enable sugar to come in free of duty from the Philippines a few years hence when a tariff is due, according to the terms of the recently enacted Independence bill. The imposition of tariff duties upon Philippine sugar would be a particularly harsh and unneeded violation of international charity and equity.

The general conclusions about existing tariffs, particularly those of Europe, is that they greatly increase international ill-will and misunderstanding and that with few exceptions they ought to be abolished as rapidly as is practicable and equitable. All

authorities on international conditions and relations are agreed that the necessity for immediate reduction of tariffs has become extremely urgent. A beginning should be made immediately. At the forthcoming International Economic Conference an agreement should be reached for a universal reduction of ten per cent on tariff duties in all countries. In the absence of such agreement, the United States

ought immediately to lower its tariff rates by this percentage. This action would not only be of great benefit to our own country but would provide a powerful example for the other countries. Moreover, and regardless of the course taken by the European nations, the United States ought to make the ten-per cent reduction an annual affair until our entire tariff structure disappears.



Soviet Secrecy

Nothing could do more to strain confidence in Russian-American partnership in the making and maintenance of peace than the feeling that to move with Russia we should have to move backward. And it would be a move backward if, instead of drawing the Soviet Government out of its attitude of suspicion and secretiveness and persuading Moscow of the advantages of opening up the avenues of communication, we should be obliged to conform to its news policy whenever we meet.

This is now one of the most estranging differences between the Soviet system and ours. We can deal on some terms with a closed and state-controlled economy. We can cooperate whole-heartedly in a world policy based on our common desire for peace. But we cannot trim our policy of freedom of information—which is the very breath of democracy, so that we should suffocate without it—to fit the Russian policy of a state-controlled press and the withdrawal of large areas of Europe from free intercourse with the rest of the world. In so far as it suggests that compromise, the news blackout at Potsdam is an extremely serious matter.—*Anne O'Hare McCormick in The NEW YORK TIMES, July 21, 1945.*

Lourdes During the War

*Reprinted from The RECORD**

LOURDES, the town of miracles and strange events, has just ended the two strangest years in its history, the two years since, in November, 1942, the Germans occupied the whole of South France in reply to the Allied landings in North Africa, says the *London Universe*.

The strangest of all has been the "invasion" of Lourdes by 2,000 workers from the "Red Belt" of Paris to work in a nearby emergency factory making airplane motors for the German war machine.

Lourdes had never seen their like before. The men were hard, cynical, unbelieving, loud-spoken mockers. The girls were the same. An innovation for Lourdes, many of the girls wore trousers.

But nothing is too difficult for Our Lady's Lourdes. Bishop Choquet began his own resistance movement.

The campaign opened with a great mission specially for the war-workers at which four first-class preachers, a Jesuit, a Dominican, a secular priest, and a missionary from France's other Communist stronghold, the Lille industrial area, preached in the novel form of dialogue, conversing together in the church.

Their conversations were broadcast through the town from loud-speakers installed in the streets, particularly the esplanade of the Grotto.

Some of the 2,000 workers went to the church through curiosity. The others, and many visitors, numbering about 5,000, stood in the streets to listen, hands in pockets, smoking cigarettes.

Gradually, as they lounged, the workers stopped smoking to listen more carefully. As the conferences went on, they listened more and more to the simple and interesting instructions on the Catholic religion. Skepticism and mockery were replaced by respect.

On the final day of the mission one of the workers visited the Bishop as deputy for a large group of his comrades. "We went to the church in the first place with clenched fists," he said. "We will return with joined hands."

These Parisians were not the only unusual visitors to Lourdes during these two years. Many people from Alsace and Lorraine, grouped round the archpriest of Metz and the Vicar General of Strasbourg, also lived in the town, maintaining at the Grotto

* Box A35, G. P. O., Perth, Australia, March 14, 1945

and the sanctuary of the shrine an atmosphere of ardent devotion, thanks to their fervent Catholicism.

The most distinguished visitor was the Primate of Poland, Cardinal Hlond. His Eminence went to Lourdes from Rome when Italy broke with the Allies, and resided for thirty-three months in the home of Bishop Choquet.

When the Germans invaded the south, His Eminence, considering that the town was too dangerous, went to live in the Benedictine Abbey of Hautecombe, at the foot of the Alps, which guards the graves of the Dukes of Savoy, ancestors of the present Italian royal family.

There the Cardinal thought he would be unmolested, as the abbey was to some extent under the protection of the Italian Crown and would, therefore, be respected even by the Gestapo. It was not so. One day the Gestapo knocked at the abbey's doors to take the Cardinal to Paris and later to Germany.

PRAYERS NEVER CEASED

The Germans, too, went to Lourdes. A party of them took over the town in the November of 1942. A Kommandantur settled in and troops were billeted in the town. The German soldiers stayed there for ten months, after which they were replaced by German customs officers.

These surrendered quietly when the

F.F.I. liberated the town. The liberation was peaceful. Not a single shot was fired in Our Lady's town.

Throughout the four years of trial, prayers never ceased at the Grotto: watch was kept from hour to hour by the people. Ceaseless, too, were the Masses for the prisoners and deportees.

Every Saturday Bishop Choquet himself went down to the Grotto to offer a Mass for peace and every Wednesday for the prisoners of war.

Even the pilgrimages did not stop all together. The French National Pilgrimage of August came as usual, that of 1943, for instance, drawing 40,000 people from many parts of France. There was also the October Rosary Pilgrimage organized by the Dominicans, in which some 15,000 to 20,000 people usually took part.

It was only last year when liberation was being achieved that the national pilgrimages stopped altogether, owing to the chaotic conditions in France, especially transport difficulties. But even so the pilgrims still crowded the Grotto in good numbers, though they were all local people, within walking distance of the town and capable of carrying all the food for the journey with them.

As liberation became a fact the pilgrims poured in again, typically in uniform. On Sunday, December 17, some 10,000 fighters arrived in town in the uniforms of the F.F.I. and the underground armies. Three trains had

somehow been secured to carry in and take home those who lived farthest away.

At their head was Archbishop Saliège, of Toulouse. Bishop Théas, of Montauban, whom the Germans had arrested and sent to the internment camp of Compiègne, celebrated the Mass and preached at the Grotto.

A few British and American Catholic soldiers were noticed among the pilgrims.

During the pilgrimage Bishop Cho-

quet stated that he hoped this was only the advance guard of a great army of pilgrims from the Allied armies who would come to Lourdes to ask the Mother of God for complete victory and a just peace.

France waits urgently to kneel once more at Our Lady's shrine and place its problems and tears at Our Lady's feet. A big pilgrimage is already being organized in Paris to go there at Easter. It is being organized by the Comte de Nadaillac.



Gratia Plena !

The Angel was not praising Mary; he was stating a fact, he was giving a message from God, an assurance that God had filled her with grace; with a "fulness" that was ever increasing. Mary was God's achievement, the praise belonged to Him: "Praise ye the Lord for He is good, for His mercy endureth for ever." All was God's: the plan was His, the choice was His, the action was His. "He that is mighty hath done great things to me, and holy is His name." Humility is truth: it was Mary's humility to know and proclaim that all in her was the work of God, and was for the work of God; so she accepted all, and offered all—Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done to me according to thy word.—*W. Bernard Dyer, O.S.C., in The CLERGY REVIEW, London, May, 1944.*

Catholic Colleges and the Interracial Question

EDWARD H. HUTH

THE question of interracial relations is not only of serious concern to the United States, but it constitutes a major threat to international peace and security. Many Catholic colleges and universities have manifested considerable interest respecting the rights of minority population groups; other institutions have done little or nothing in regard to racial tensions, which are, perhaps, more grievous in the United States than at any other place in the entire world.¹

The struggle of minorities for their rights is as old as civilization, and as universal as the social organization of mankind. Throughout recorded history reformers have dreamed of a world in which there would be a realization of equality of opportunity for all races of mankind; a recognition of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. Unfortunately, such a concept finds, in the world today, more intellectual acceptance than practical social application.

Sociologists apply the term "racial minority" to a group of people composing less than half of the total

This address was given by Dr. Huth, head of Dayton University's Department of Sociology, at a meeting of the National Catholic Education Association, Dayton, Ohio, May 11, 1945.

population, and which differs, or is assumed to differ, from the majority group. Members of a minority racial group develop, in varying degrees, an attitude of mind which gives them a feeling of greater security in their own group than they enjoy with respect to the majority group. An outstanding characteristic of all racial tensions is the attitude of superiority or inferiority, consciously accepted or tacitly assumed. Racial attitudes, friendly or antagonistic, may be the result of careful and accurate scientific research, but more frequently they are the product of very limited and false information, distorted by subjective interpretations.

According to the 16th Census, taken in 1940, the racial composition of the United States was 89.8 per cent white; 9.8 per cent Negro; and only 0.4 per cent other non-white races.² Whites

¹ Henry Pratt Fairchild (ed.), *Dictionary of Sociology*, Philosophical Library (New York, 1944), 134, 194; Francis J. Brown, and Joseph Slabey Roucek (eds.), *One America, The History, Contributions, and Present Problems of Our Racial and National Minorities* (New York, 1945), 3.

² United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940, Population, Second Series, Characteristics of the Population, United States Summary* (Washington, 1943).

numbered 118,214,870; Negroes, 12,-865,518; and other non-white races 588,887. From this it is evident that Negroes constitute the largest racial minority group in the United States. If the population were evenly distributed, approximately one person among every ten would be a Negro. Other non-white minority races in this country are the Chinese, Japanese, and Indians; they constitute only one person in every 250 of the general population, and do not present a serious threat in any way to our public welfare.

PROGRESS OF THE NEGRO

Four-score years ago the Negro was emancipated and turned from a life of complete dependence upon his owner and master for the necessities of life to the status of a freedman, without friends, education, or property. Nevertheless, during the past eighty years, the Negro has made great progress.

In 1870, 81.4 per cent of all Negroes ten years old and over were illiterate, but by 1900, less than half were in that classification. By 1930, the last year for which data on illiteracy were obtained, only one out of every eight Negroes could not read and write.³ In 1940 the median number of school years completed by Negroes twenty-five years old and over,

from whom reports were received, was only 5.7 years. This group of the Negro population included, however, more than 80,000 persons who had completed four or more years of college education. In 1940 there were about 110,000 Negroes in various professions, as compared with approximately 34,000 in 1890. Professions in which Negroes increased include the ministry, teaching, medicine, dentistry, nursing, law and social welfare.⁴ There are today almost 3,000 Negroes teaching in colleges and universities. Widespread ignorance among Negroes in certain parts of the United States can be explained by the lack of educational opportunities.

Many ignorant and prejudiced persons believe that Negroes are incapable of learning, or of living on the same economic basis as whites. Yet, there are very many instances to prove that such reasoning is not only illogical, but absolutely contrary to the facts. Take, for example, the following list of distinguished Negro leaders who are outstanding in various fields: Marian Anderson, Dr. George Washington Carver, Brigadier-General Benjamin O. Davis, Dr. William E. B. Du Bois, Judge William H. Hastie, Roland Hayes, Sergeant Joe Louis, Paul Robeson, Dr. James H. Robinson, Booker T. Washington, Dr. Charles H. Wesley.

³ United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Population: Special Report, Series P., No. 4, November 4, 1943*, p. 2.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 2-3.

In the field of industry, as in education, the Negro has made substantial advancement. According to a report, late in 1943, Negroes made up 8.7 per cent of the workers employed in shipbuilding, and 4 per cent of the labor force in aircraft construction. In iron and steel manufacture about 100,000 Negro workers are employed. Reliable estimates set our total war production employment at about 20,000,000 of whom approximately 1,500,000 are Negroes.⁵ During 1943 more than 112,000 Negroes were enrolled and completed war-production training, trade, professional and clerical courses. In the South the opening of skilled jobs to Negroes has been slow; the most significant gains have been made in shipbuilding and aircraft production.⁶

Despite the general improvement of the Negro in recent years, he is still at a tremendous disadvantage in comparison with whites. The color-line, for example, has developed into a so-called fundamental American tradition, which regards the Negro as inherently and permanently inferior. Today there are many restrictions upon the Negro's right to work, to vote, to earn a living wage and to belong to a labor union. In many places educated Negroes are refused employment in fields for which they are thoroughly qualified, and forced to

accept menial jobs. It requires stupendous hypocrisy for Americans to demand that persecution of the Jews be stopped; that the integrity of small nations be respected; that economic injustices in remote countries of the world be eliminated, when millions of American Negroes, who are citizens of the United States, are denied their constitutional rights.

Due to this unfortunate discrimination, which is as contrary to the Christian religion as it is contradictory to the fundamental law of the land, many Negroes are turning to radical groups for sympathy and relief. Enforced segregation has been largely responsible for high rents and unhealthy congested living conditions among Negroes. Segregation is not only unjust to those who are its victims, but it also injures those who advocate and support it.

No condition is more dangerous for a country than a situation where large numbers of its citizens are denied equality of opportunity in social, economic, political and religious affairs. Five times since the attack on Pearl Harbor disastrous race riots have broken out in Mobile, Alabama, Beaumont, Texas, Detroit, New York City and in Philadelphia. In a less virulent form, racial tension is expressed through community anxiety, hostile attitudes, "bumper" and "disappoint-

⁵ Russell H. Kurtz (ed.), *Social Work Year Book 1945* (New York, 1945), 194-199; 280-288.

⁶ *Ibid.*

ment" clubs. A number of cities, including Dayton, Ohio, have experienced work stoppages caused by white employes in war plants who objected to the employment or promotion of Negro workers. Lack of discretion on the part of some police officers has sometimes provoked explosive incidents. Congested local and regional transportation facilities have frequently accentuated racial tensions, when Negroes and whites have crowded and twisted into busses, trolley coaches and railway cars.

RACISM CONDEMNED

The doctrine of racism stands condemned by every teaching of experimental science, natural reason, ethical standards and Christian doctrine. The principles of the Catholic Church regarding the race question have been clearly set forth in the Four Gospels; in the papal social encyclicals;⁷ in the writings of theologians and scholars of the Church. From the very beginning of its history, the Church has proclaimed the great truth that all men are equal in their destiny, equal in the sight of God and equal in their immortality. Fundamentally, there is nothing incomprehensible about respecting each human being for what he is under God. There is nothing mysterious in the simple truth that

Christ died for all men, regardless of race, color, or nationality.

Out of a population of some 13,000,000 Negroes in the United States today, only about 325,000 are Catholics. While the proportion of Catholics in the Negro population has risen from one in 60 to one in 40 during the past twenty years, only 2.5 per cent of the Negroes are Catholics. Here is a situation which presents a challenge and an opportunity to Catholic Colleges, which should lead the way in educating and converting an estimated 7,750,000 unchurched Negroes.⁸ No other intellectual force is so powerful, so likely to succeed and so influential in providing good leadership.

The record of Catholics, generally, appears to be far from satisfactory. There are many, of course, who have succeeded to a certain degree. There are still more who approve of interracial cooperation in theory, but who do little or nothing in practice. If the more than 20,000,000 Catholics in this country would practice their faith in their treatment of Negroes, if they would recognize the equality of races under God, if they would try to interest Negroes in the Church, if they would by their example demonstrate faith in the brotherhood of man, then the wish of Our Saviour to teach all

⁷ *Rerum Novarum*, Condition of Working Classes, Leo XIII, 1891; *Quadragesimo Anno*, Social Reconstruction, Pius XI, 1931; *Serum Laetitiae*, To the Church in the United States, Pius XII, 1939; *Mystici Corporis*, The Mystical Body, Pius XII, 1943.

⁸ *The National Catholic Almanac* (Paterson, N. J., 1945), 327-329; *Interracial Review* (April, 1945), 50.

nations and all races would have greater possibility of realization. If the responsibility is left to the small number now trying to perform it, then those who refuse to cooperate must resign themselves to a continuation of the present unsatisfactory racial relations.

As far as higher education is concerned, there are many Catholic colleges that will not accept Negro students, but it is gratifying to know that every year more and more Catholic colleges are admitting properly qualified Negro students. The interracial objective of the Catholic college is simple: it seeks interracial justice; it denounces racism; it teaches the Gospel and Christian doctrine to all races; it applies Christian principles to interracial questions, and it enlists the active support of educated young men and women, who will become the leaders of tomorrow.

RACE RELATIONS PROGRAM

A Catholic college program of race relations is absolutely necessary and of immediate importance. The aims can be realized in whole, or in part, by instituting the following reforms and practices:

1. Add courses pertaining to ethnology and interracial relations to the college curriculum.
2. Admit properly qualified Negroes as students. This will help to educate the Negro for leadership. If

the interracial problem is to be solved, it will require the intelligent leadership of all races working together in a spirit of Christian brotherhood.

3. Strive to have colored students admitted to professional and graduate schools on an equal basis with white students, and when they are trained to have them admitted to practice their professions.

4. Establish Catholic college missions, and arrange for interracial religious services. The religious welfare of colored students should not be neglected.

5. Request the university library to add significant books and periodicals dealing with racial problems. The *Interracial Review* is the leading Catholic magazine of the world devoted exclusively to problems of interracial justice.

6. Organize college interracial study clubs, institutes of interracial cooperation, intercollegiate interracial councils, and college alumni race relations councils. In such organizations a member or a panel of members initiate the discussion, guide it and develop thoughts of the members. Every member has an opportunity to contribute knowledge, experiences and observations.

7. Encourage and help to organize civic interracial councils, symposia and forums.

8. Use the local and national radio

facilities for discussions of interracial questions.

9. Sponsor good-will tours to areas occupied by non-white racial groups.

10. Start club or settlement work in neglected non-white neighborhoods.

11. Arrange for civic interracial dinners such as are held in Cincinnati, Ohio.

12. Student Sodality Unions and other Catholic Action societies may include interracial justice sessions as part of their agenda.

13. Judge our non-white friends, not by their color, but by their personal adherence to normal standards of character and conduct.

14. Institute research studies in race relations and cultural contributions.

15. Advance the growing interest of the press in the Catholic interracial movement. College publications may also be used for articles on interracial topics.

16. Educate the students and the public regarding interracial justice as expressed in the papal encyclicals.

17. Establish college chapters of the NAACP.

18. Address high schools, colleges, parish and civic organizations regarding interracial relations. There must be no moratorium on sound thinking.

19. Protest against Negro discrimination in the armed forces.

20. Help the Negro to emancipate himself from economic discrimination, social proscription, political frustration and mob intimidation.

In conclusion, race discrimination is the outward manifestation of personal attitudes, emotions and prejudices. It can be conquered or reduced only by appropriate educational processes in the home, in the school, in the church and in organized public life, which teach Christian principles of justice and apply faith and reason to our treatment of our fellow-countrymen. Let all who look forward to a new birth of freedom in the postwar period, which will follow the present age of devastation, materialism and moral decay, be ever mindful that all races are brothers in the Mystical Body of Christ.



A Rose is the Same

The Anarchist activists used to speak of "revolutionary minorities"; the Revolutionary Syndicalists—of the "proletarian elite"; the Communists—of the "proletarian vanguard"; the Fascists—of the "national elite" or the "master race." How many ways of saying the same thing: the rule by and for their own clique!—*Max Nomad in The NEW LEADER.*

Our "Emotionally Unfit"

RAYMOND J. HUNT, O.M.I., Ph.D.

*Reprinted from the OBLATE WORLD**

A FEW months ago, I met a young civilian whom I had known for several years. I was surprised to meet him as a civilian, for he was to all appearances what our armed services have been looking for. He explained that he had been turned down by his draft board, although "there was nothing seriously wrong with him." A short time later I heard that he had been turned down as "emotionally unfit."

This young man is but one of more than 1,500,000 men in civilian life in this country who have been rejected for military service or discharged from it for mental disabilities. One isolated case of emotional instability does not seem important; but when you find that these cases run into the millions, it should set you thinking. It may be quite true that nothing lies like statistics, but it is likewise true that there is nothing so brutal as a fact. And to every thinking American it should be a frightening thing to realize that there are so many mentally unfit people in this country of ours.

It was estimated as late as 1944 that in this country alone we have more than 700,000 patients in mental

institutions, more than the total number of patients hospitalized for all other causes combined. We have more hospitalized cases of schizophrenia than of tuberculosis. Dr. Kenneth E. Appel, of the medical staff of the University of Pennsylvania, recently estimated that there are 1,000,000 children in our public schools today who one day will go to mental hospitals if things go on as they are.

So my friend of the emotional instability has plenty of company. And we must realize that as this war goes on we will have more and more mental cases, so that in time we shall have a considerable portion of our population who are mentally sick or who have been told that they are mentally sick.

When figures like these finally sink into our minds, the normal impulse is to wonder what the cause of such widespread mental trouble can be. Unfortunately it is quite impossible to say that this or that factor is the cause. The human mind is such a complex mechanism that, in this day and age, we are not yet capable of defining things so accurately. But medicine, psychiatry and psychology,

* 225 Fargo Ave., Buffalo 13, N. Y., June, 1945

in sifting the known facts, have found what seems to be the common denominator in most of these mental ills. This war has done nothing to contradict that finding, but rather has lent it more credence.

The common factor basic to most of these mental troubles is the *inability of these people to meet the realities of life*. And according to the up-to-the-minute opinion, they cannot meet the realities of life simply because the *American home* and the *American public-school system*, have fallen down on the job. This is not just a case of looking for the traditional goat to pin the blame upon. There has been a real failure on the part of the American home and the public school system. These institutions are producing young people who are not prepared to meet, let alone face and solve, the problems of everyday life. When they do meet these problems, as meet them they must, mental aberrations are the result.

FAILURE OF PARENTS

Much of the failure on the part of the home occurs in the adolescent years of the children, those all important "teen-age" years. During these years, our youngsters are supposed to be passing over the bridge that joins childhood and adulthood. The parents are supposed to be training them to take on the responsibilities of grown-ups. It is precisely because many parents fail in

this training that we have so many people in our country today who cannot face the basic facts of life. It becomes much easier for them to develop a mysterious illness known as a psychoneurosis—maybe hysteria or neurasthenia, or psychasthenia. These mysterious illnesses will always afford them an explanation of why they cannot take the ordinary jolts in life.

You remember Johnny Smith, don't you? He's the youngster who lived next door. Remember how you used to marvel at the care his loving parents lavished on him? He was a nice kid, was Johnny. But he wasn't quite like the rest of the youngsters in the neighborhood, was he? There was something soft and fragile about him. He never quite fitted into the picture. Remember he quit one school in town because his teachers didn't understand him. Then there was the other school in which he didn't make good either, this time because they didn't teach quite the things he wanted to learn. No, the army didn't take Johnny. Strange about that, wasn't it? They said something about "emotionally unfit." I wonder why?

You've seen Jim Jones around town, haven't you? I wonder what ever happened to Jim? He's getting on close to the forties now. But Jim has never come up to expectations. I wonder why? You knew Jim as a boy, didn't you? He seemed like a good kid. The folks had great plans

for Jim, had his life all planned for him like a sightseeing trip through Chinatown—no changes allowed, no self-assertion, no excursions into responsibility, no sir, none of that for Jim. Too bad he never quite made the grade. He must have discovered that life is more complex than a bus ride.

DEFECTIVE TRAINING

We could go on for many an hour enumerating little cases like that. And every one of those cases would have one thing in common—an indictment of many homes for the failure to train youth for life. There will be many parents who will question what we have said here. All we can say to them is this. How many times did you ever sit down with your youngsters in their years of adolescence and discuss with them the tremendous problems that accompany these "growing-up" years? Very many of the mentally and emotionally unfit in our country today are that way because some big problem that came during adolescence was either never solved or was wrongly solved.

Did you help build up in your youngsters a spirit of independence in those teen-age years? Or did you shelter your boys and girls so that actually they passed from childhood to adulthood, never having experienced the all-important years of adolescence? Or perhaps you went to the opposite extreme and allowed

the spirit of independence to grow to such proportions that it could never again be brought under control?

Where did your boy or girl learn about life? From you? Or was it from the gang on the corner, or the crowd gathered around the neighborhood juke box? You see, if you left it for someone else to train your youngster, the chances are that he has reached, or will reach adulthood, unequipped to take up the problems of grown men and women.

Our schools are still going on their merry way, giving a good training as far as it goes, but never going far enough. It is the old problem of training half the man and ignoring the other half. Our public-school system will never be able to give an adequate answer to the indictment that it complacently ignores the most important side of man, his soul, and all that it connotes. The school can never hope to send out into the world young people who are ready to solve life's problems, because these young people, today and tomorrow, will be getting the same lopsided training—all matter and no spirit.

We have a very strange situation in this country of ours. Our public schools are training only the material side of our youth. And our psychiatrists, by and large, are approaching the problem of mental troubles with inadequate cures. The one is helping produce mental instability by forget-

ting the soul, the other is trying to cure mental unfitness by ignoring the spirit. Both are making the same mistake. A purely scientific approach to this problem will never provide the answer when the soul and God are not considered.

In prayer, meditation and mortification, as well as the other things of religion, we have factors which will often prevent many of our mental ills. In these same things we have the means of curing many of these same ills. Psychical re-education, which is necessary in every case of mental unfitness, implies the building up again through mental exercises the faculties of the mind. Religion itself, when faithfully practiced, affords the best and surest means of psychical re-education, for in religion, in meditation and in prayer and mortification all the mental faculties are exercised in a calm, joyous and peaceful spirit.

No one with sense would ever

claim that all mental illnesses are brought on through the things we have described. But so many are that it would be a wonderful investment for American life if our homes and schools realized fully the task that is theirs, and did it as it should be done. The home and the school must build up the wills of our youth so that they have within themselves the energy to heal their own mind troubles. Build up their wills so that they are not soft or languid or fearful or easily discouraged. Train them in the habit of refusing to admit themselves beaten. Teach them to meet life, resolved to fight it out to the bitter end. If we can teach our youths to be what they can be, mental diseases, for the most part, will fail to lay hold of their minds. But you cannot train or teach them adequately, nor can you cure them if they have these troubles, unless you bring God and the things of God into their lives.



Pax Romana

The international association of Catholic university graduates, Pax Romana, will meet this year in Mexico for its first world gathering since that at Washington in 1939.

After the congress in Washington a secretariat was set up there through which Catholic students have been able to keep in touch. Since then developments have been remarkable and thirteen new federations have joined Pax Romana from North and South America and India.—*From The WANDERER, St. Paul, June 7, 1945.*

THE EDITORIAL MIND

Federal School Aid

HEARINGS are being held in Congress on two bills providing for federal aid to schools. One bill (S. 181—HR1296) would limit federal subsidies to public schools. It is supported by the National Education Association.

Reporting on a hearing on this measure, *Time Magazine* (May 7) said: "Some Catholics are afraid that their parochial schools would suffer." That is an understatement. Catholics hold that the bill is unjust because it excludes from its benefits private religious schools which, though not supported by public taxation, are in effect public schools. They meet State standards and serve the community as well as do any other schools.

Private as well as public schools would benefit under the Mead-Aiken bill (S. 717). This measure was endorsed at a congressional hearing by Matthew Woll, vice-president of the American Federation of Labor, and by representatives of the Federation of Teachers and of State and local teachers' organizations.

Mr. Woll insisted that "any fund the national government gives must be used by any State equally for all

persons for whom it is given." He also attacked the specious argument that a grant of public funds to pupils of a religious school would establish a union of Church and State. He pointed out that for some time public funds have been used for hospitals which are under religious auspices. He also noted that the Federal Government aided denominational schools through the National Youth administration, the Office of Education, the Public Works administration, etc.

Catholics contend that the Mead-Aiken bill would benefit pupils more than schools. They hold that all school children, regardless of religious affiliation, are entitled to federal aid in those areas where federal subsidies are needed.—*The MICHIGAN CATHOLIC, Detroit, Mich., June 21, 1945.*

Vocations in Wartime

PREVIOUS war experience has revealed a spiritual resurgence in the lives of Catholic youth. The stress on material values in the operation of war, the killings, cruelties and sufferings and all its other tragic concomitants seemed to drive serious young minds to look for the more lasting values as represented in the

things of God. Vocations to the life of religion have usually shown a sharp increase during war years and those immediately following.

It appears a natural reaction for those brought up in the spirit of faith. The fleeting nature of the ambitions, successes and standards of this world and the false worth placed upon its attractions are mirrored in the casualty lists. The eternal destiny of men becomes more real, and dedication to its interests seems more realistic. Youth finishing their schooling and planning a future see a worthwhile contribution to their own and their fellowman's true happiness in the life-work of trying to save souls.

It is probably too early to judge whether this war will corroborate or contradict the experience of the past. How many Catholic boys and girls in their 'teens are being inspired to reach out to serve the higher needs and nobler hopes of men? There are no statistics to cite. It is to be hoped that history will repeat itself.

A vocation, of course, is not man-made. It is inspired of God. "You have not chosen Me but I have chosen you." But cooperation with the Divine call is a matter of personal choice. God implants the desire but He does not compel the free will of the individual.

It is more than a passing obligation, therefore, for parents and those who have the guidance of youth to en-

courage the first signs of a vocation and foster the home atmosphere and environs that will strengthen it to fruition.—*The EVANGELIST, Albany, N. Y., June 22, 1945.*

Joy in Christ

TRUE Christian living or piety never burdens the soul with sadness and grief. If there is today such a vast amount of grief, mental and spiritual disorder and depression, it is surely because the simple Gospel teaching has been spurned and the shallow doctrines of worldliness have been substituted for life and joy giving Christianity. What is sorely needed today is the expulsion of the former and the return to the latter. Perhaps now, after all the sorrows and tribulations of the past years of total war experiences, men will be more eager to open doors and windows and let the sun of truth and joy come in and to open their ears to the festive sounds of the glad tidings of Christianity. Why is it that so many go to church services on Sundays and Feasts as if they were to bury one of their dearest relatives or friends or as if they had done some great wrong and now were to give an account of it? Are they not aware of the glad tidings of Christianity?

"With desolation the earth has become desolate because there is none who considers in his heart." These words of the Prophet Jeremias of old apply in a very special way to the

confusion of the mind and spirit of modern man. Will he now at last, facing this desolation, begin to consider in his heart and bring order into the chaos of his mind before he sets to work to reconstruct a devastated world about him? Will he learn the great lesson contained in the fundamental teachings of Christianity? Joy and inner contentment are even today the fruits of true Christian living as they were also in past ages. Christianity will ever be the glad tidings for all men of thought and good will. The fact that special efforts seem to be required to convince even great numbers of Christians of this truth is clear proof that it has as yet not been thoroughly grasped and lived by them. Only those who follow in the footsteps of the only real joy bringer, Christ, will find in His message the key to a life of order and blessedness. —*The WANDERER, St. Paul, Minn., May 17, 1945.*

Filth in Evening Dress

MANY a jokester whose humor has misfired has been set down with that withering crack—"Yeah, you're funny—funny as a crutch." When you come to think of it, there is nothing humorous about crutches. To see anything laughable in such a sight supposes an individual too coarse to sympathize with the unfortunate and too brutal to respect weakness.

And by the same token no decent

person should find anything to laugh at in a dirty story. For a rotten story is funny only when you ignore the sacredness of marriage and the high purpose of the sex relationship. That fornication, adultery and other sex abnormalities are considered ludicrous and laugh-provoking, furnishes indisputable evidence that material progress has been made at the cost of stunted, corrupted human souls. Men and women are working and playing in the obscene, filthy atmosphere once considered proper only to waterfront dives, houses of ill-fame, or similar disreputable places.

Many shops, factories, offices, club-houses, for all their air-conditioning, indirect lighting and luxurious appointments, now rival the filthy holes on the waterfront where dock rats spewed forth the sordid vomit of their debased and rotten minds.

There was a time when the dirty story knew its place and kept it. Dirty stories were for dirty people. They belonged to the gutter, the dive or the joint. Even the man who might whisper an indecent story to another man would blush with shame at the mere suspicion it had reached the ears of his womenfolk. That was before the dirty story crashed society and was admitted to the home, the dinner party or the social gathering; before men lost their respect for womanhood and motherhood and for their own dignity as men.

Evening clothes will never reform

the indecent story. Just as well dress a leper in the advanced stage of his hideous disease in a tuxedo and pass him off for a healthy man. The rotten story will now and always disease the mind that harbors it and curse the tongue that speaks it.—*The CATHOLIC MIRROR, Springfield, Mass., May, 1945.*

For Life and Its Sequel

DR. GEORGE STODDARD, Commissioner of Education in the State of New York, wisely advocates the leavening of every kind of technical training with some genuine liberal education. He believes that each student requires some basic liberal courses. "Technical institutes and vocational junior colleges," he says, "need more than a whiff of the liberal. The mind of the student must not rest exclusively on the forty hours per week in which he will earn a living."

For, as he points out, the student will not spend all his adult life in working. His education must prepare him for "the seventy working hours [each week] that will be devoted to marketing, reading, family life, civic life, and recreation. These activities will determine his happiness beyond anything available in most occupations."

Dr. Stoddard is right in maintaining that an education which does no more than train the student in salesmanship, truck gardening, beauty

culture, or dish-washing, prepares him for but a part of his future life. There is the rest of that future life, the substantial portion which will not be spent at work, to be taken into consideration. What is the potential worker to do with his free time? Must he not be readied to use it wisely and well? He will not, like a punch press, stand idle in the factory between one day's close and the next day's start.

But there is a bigger question on which the commissioner does not touch at all. It is the meaning and the purpose of life as a whole. This is fundamental in truly successful and happy living, and therefore cannot be neglected in any education at all apposite to life. The student must know what kind of being man is, what his nature is, what his destiny is, the character of both the freedom and the responsibility which are man's endowment and which mark man off from every other earthly being. The student must be prepared not only for the several parts of life, for labor and for leisure, but for life as a whole, the mortal span with all that it contains, involves, implies and portends. Living is not a job of piece work; it is a seamless entirety on the quality of which a man's eternity depends. Therefore an education worthy of man must prepare him for life and for the life beyond life.—*The CATHOLIC TRANSCRIPT, Hartford, Conn., July 12, 1945.*

Group Hatred and Democracy

MOST REV. RICHARD J. CUSHING, DD., Archbishop of Boston

WHEN representatives of three large religious groups in the United States gather to work for social justice, there is hope of international peace ahead. Probably no one — anywhere in the world — really doubts that justice belongs to the whole human race in all its entirety; those who know God know that it is the reflection in finite things of His eternal justice. But only those whose life is centered in God will be stirred to sustain an unyielding battle until the man-made barriers that impede the flow of justice be torn down and crushed into dust.

That is why a meeting like this is important. We are, however, realists, and we cannot but acknowledge to ourselves that so far our efforts have had but slight results. This same disheartening observation might have been made by the forward-looking founders of our country, leaders who not only were to witness the driving of the wedge into the almost hopelessly blind wall of colonial prejudices, but were themselves to produce the historic document which at the same time that it declared us politically free presented to the world a statement of the true and eternal principles of just government upon which our nation is built.

An address delivered to a joint meeting of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, Boston, Mass., May 24, 1945. Reprinted from THE PILOT.*

It is those principles which urge us, the political descendants of the Founding Fathers, to defend all liberties wherever we see them attacked or endangered, and the success that rewarded the consecrated leadership of our first war gives us encouragement and hope that the thoughtfulness that should attend a new post-war era will help us rid our country of the evils that are now gnawing at the entrails of our society.

The motives that drove the early immigrants across the ocean to America were many and varied, but back of most of them was the specter of persecution, in front of them the promise of freedom. That held true, certainly, for the majority of the English who came to New England, to Maryland, to Pennsylvania in the 17th century, and for the Germans and the Irish who opened up the lands beyond the Alleghanies in the 18th century. It was but natural that those immigrants would bring with them the hatred and the fears upon which

* 49 Franklin St., Boston 10, Mass., May 26, 1945

they had been fed in a Europe that had been shattered religiously and was beginning to crumble politically. The colonial schools and colleges which trained the children of those immigrants took prejudices for granted and even regarded them as safeguards of their society.

In that atmosphere of accepted bigotry and respectable intolerance, it would have been easy for the leaders of the colonists, when they decided to make the break with the mother country, to drift with the tide of popular narrowness so long as their own fortunes and positions were secure. But their leadership was of better stuff. Even while, and though, Revolutionary armies were being recruited by an old familiar appeal to bigotry, the Founding Fathers of our nation were stripping things down to fundamentals, patiently placing principle before policy, drawing on the wisdom of all ages, adapting it and casting it into a new mold. They not merely personally broke with previous bigotry but officially they began to build their policies on new principles of sane civil tolerance.

NECESSITY OF GOD

In their Declaration of Independence, they announced a government which recognized God as the source of authority and the fountain-head of the rights of man, rights which must be respected by just governments everywhere. Ancient Greece and

Rome, the medieval Italian republics, the social philosophy of the great European kingdoms, the political theories of the British Constitution, all gave of their experience and their theories to the Founding Fathers, but they gave that previous history a fresh note and a new departure when they actually set up a government on the acceptance of the inalienable rights of man as a self-evident truth, a truth admitting of neither qualification nor debate.

There was another premise, however, basic to their new thought. From one point of view, the character of our nation might be truly called a Declaration of Dependence—of dependence on God. It is a way of saying that without God there can be no true democracy. The Declaration is the substance of our government, and the substance of that Declaration is its insistence upon the God-given character of the rights of man. That doctrine is the soul that gives America its characteristic breath of life.

Now we are fighting, nation against nation, in global warfare, to save that soul—to save it for ourselves, to make it possible for others. We know only too well that the world has brought sorrow and desolation upon itself by forgetting God and glorifying man as man, supreme and omnipotent. Analyze the ideologies that threaten us: Nazism glorifies man in race; Communism glorifies man in the masses; Fascism glorifies man in the

mere citizen of the state; Shintoism glorifies man in the god-emperor.

These are the ugly philosophies behind the forces that attacked us—against which we are fighting, we who believe that “all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.”

Make no mistake about the outcome of this war. Despite our recent victory, the war is still lost unless it succeeds in maintaining for ourselves and for the world the everlasting principles enshrined in our Declaration of Independence. One of these is the doctrine of the Divine origin of the rights of man. Another is the human duty of acknowledging the rights of God.

Some day our armed forces will defeat our last enemy. Then, when the power of our totalitarian foes has been overthrown, we shall rejoice that our homes and our altars will be safe. But will they be safe in any permanent sense? Can we be sure? It might be wiser to say: “Our homes and our altars will be safe unless someone destroys them from within.” That possibility still exists.

STANDARDS OF MORALITY

Here is a paradox to consider. On several foreign fronts Americans have fought and are fighting with the zeal of crusaders to preserve the God-given rights of man. But on the home front, meanwhile, men and women—many men and many women—are abandoning the standards of morality which

protect those rights, are making a mockery of that “pursuit of happiness” which should be the exercise of those rights, sometimes even presuming to use as their excuse for their actions the demands which wartime acceleration makes upon their health and nervous systems.

About one hundred years ago a certain political faction died a quiet death after its members became known as “barn-burners.” The name came from the well-publicized act of a misguided farmer who, with more zeal than intelligence, burned down his barn to get rid of rats. I am sorry to note evidence that there are barn-burners a-plenty among us. Our victory over the Axis will be hollow, indeed, if in winning it we wilfully sacrifice at home the very things that we fought abroad to save.

Concentrating upon the defeat of the enemy, we may lose sight of our ultimate goal: to remain a strong nation living in accordance with a definite set of principles and a definite moral code. Such a nation we have hitherto been, especially when the training ground of our sound citizenry was the home, when God-fearing parents reared God-fearing children in His love, and dedicated the home to the exalted service God Himself assigned to it. It needs but a moment's reflection to see that certain aspects of the war program are fraught with danger to this unit—this cell—of society. Juvenile delinquency, increase

of major crimes, divorce, defeatism, excessive luxury, and the rapid rise of Communism and other subversive systems of thought are at work tearing down the very sources of our strength, blasting the ideals we proclaimed so passionately as we asked out best boys to go forth to fight and die for them on distant battlefields.

Five years ago I used to hear much talk about "the American way of life." You and I know boys who gladly died for what they then heard about it. I must confess to a certain uneasiness when I now hear less often about it. Can it be that those who stayed at home are less willing to live by that tradition than those who went abroad were willing to die for it?

To lay the blame for the appalling conditions in our society on the war is to cloud the issue and shirk our own responsibility. The war only aggravated a case of moral anemia from which we had been suffering ever since first we began to exclude God from our lives. We are paying now for this, our initial crime. No people ever denied God without eventually turning on their fellowmen. The convenient example of the moment—the horrible example, if you will—is, of course, the Nazi State. A distinguished Jewish columnist recently gave a flawless analysis of the religious, or rather the irreligious, roots of Nazism. It is worth repeating here tonight, for its application is universal. Wherever Christian nations diminish or deny

their integral faith because of their attachment to any doctrine or practice inconsistent with that Faith, immediately the seeds of destruction are sown.

George Sokolsky writes that it was his emphasis on race—a non-Christian emphasis—that forced Hitler to hate not Judaism alone, but Christianity. "He could not imagine that the intellectually dominating forces of Western civilization, the Old and New Testaments, were written by men who were not Aryans. If the apostles were Jews, how could Christianity be anything but offensive to Aryans? If Christ came from among these peoples Christ must be inferior to Thor. The emphasis here is not anti-Jew. If we are to understand the confusions in Hitler's mind, it must be pro-Aryan, pro-Nordic. In a word, everything in history that is not Aryan, not German, was, to his mind, trash.

"And so, Hitler's great war was not against the United States, Great Britain and Russia. His real war was against God. For to him God must be wrong as He is not exclusively an Aryan. His racial purity cannot be complete, as He is God of all men, even the inferior races."

The outcome of reasoning like this is war—international fratricidal war. And the roots of it are negation, the negation of the ancient faith.

Let me put it another way. Let me put it positively, as you and I prefer to put things. It is historically true

that a nation's strength—its spiritual strength, which is the kind that chiefly counts—may be gauged by its fidelity to God. The God-fearing nation enjoys the fruits of its fidelity. All other things that make for national strength are added to it: opportunity for manhood, reverence for womanhood, a sound family life, schools that teach men how to live well here on earth in order that they may live eternally in the sight of God. Jesus Christ once said to His disciples: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and all things else shall be added to you!" That is good spirituality. It is also good sociology. It is excellent community ethics.

So, if we are to preserve our American heritage we must once again put first things first. I think that is what our Founding Fathers did. I submit that we must do so, too, before it is too late.

One place to begin doing so is in our peace plans. Some of us sense in many of the plans for the post-war world which have so far appeared a sign of the degeneration of our political concepts. A new society based on almost any one of these plans would have the same inherent fatal weaknesses that have already caused two appalling wars. Nowhere in them do we find convincing evidence that their authors recognize God and His natural law with its concepts of rights and duties as they apply to nations as well as to individuals. Nowhere in them is

there any real place for religious morality, let alone religion. They do not read like the harbingers of a new and better era. The ring of these international charters is very hollow, indeed, as compared to that of the great charter of our national liberties, the political credo of old America, the Declaration of Independence.

MOAT IN OUR EYES

Yet, even before we give ourselves over completely to international planning we had best take careful stock of our national spiritual resources. Unless we do, we may find ourselves a nation of Mrs. Jellybys'. You remember that thoroughly sincere woman in *Bleak House* who was so concerned with the plight of the heathen in Africa that she devoted all her energies to plans for the colonization of Borrioboola-Gha while her own family shifted for themselves in a chaotic household for which she had neither time nor attention. There are grave grounds for asserting that our national household (like Mrs. Jellyby's) is in chaos. Is it not presumptuous to talk of creating an international society if we ignore the decline of family morality that is undermining our national vitality? May not the world raise its eyebrows if we preach a democratic peace when class hatred, race discrimination, and religious warfare are becoming a commonplace of our national life?

World peace we must have, an in-

ternational organization to preserve that peace we must help construct. But these elaborate technical plans must find support in a moral atmosphere, and this requires that first we rid our hearts of enmity and hate here at home, and fill them with love of God and love of neighbor—not at the ends of the earth alone—but right here, at home!

In all this weary, silly world are there any men so foolish as those who talk world peace and are deaf to neighborhood discord, or who bid us love the human race but hate the man next door?

"Six things there are which the Lord hateth," says the Book of Proverbs, "and the seventh His soul detesteth: haughty eyes, a lying tongue, hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that deviseth wicked plots, feet that are swift to run to mischief, a deceitful witness that uttereth lies, and him that soweth discord among brethren." Into this seventh class fall the exponents of racial and religious prejudice. Their number, sad to say, is legion. Judging by the amount of anti-Catholic literature of all kinds rolling from the presses of this country, judging by the opposition being organized against Catholics, Jews and Negroes, a staggering percentage of people in this land of the free must still hate many millions of Americans!

Unfortunately the only basis of unity some people have is a hate which they nurture in common. Some are

united in their hatred of the American way of life; others in their hatred of Catholics, of Protestants, of Jews; others in their hatred of the Ten Commandments, of discipline, of order; we have even seen mighty organizations grow up in our country around a hatred for nicotine and for fermented grapes! But this sort of thing becomes intolerable when sowers of discord feed hatred by indicting a whole people because of the delinquency of a few individuals.

GOSPEL OF HATE

Some do this because there is no charity in them and they frankly follow a gospel of hate. Others do this out of a mistaken and distorted sense of the excellence of their own race or nationality, forgetting that no national or other group claims can possibly prescribe the prior claims of humanity. There is a pathetic story told of a Negro who was filling out a questionnaire. He came to the question: "What is your race?" With unconscious irony he wrote: "Human!"

What better one-word parable for a generation which persecutes those not of its own race. Don't forget it! that your race is, first of all, the human race! the race for which Christ died. For sentimentality's sake, there is nothing wrong about being happy about your Irish, Italian, or French, ancestry. Such pride in nationality has been a great factor in human progress, as we can appreciate in the art,

architecture, literature of the various peoples of the earth. Each has its own unique and beautiful type of expression.

But that pride of nationality which leads one race to hate another is a wicked thing. To hate people of another nationality is to hate Christ! We can hate their ideas, but we cannot hate them. They are of our race . . . the human race which Christ died to redeem. He loves everyone of them. We are not "one in Him" unless we do the same.

That is why I argue that, so far as Christians are concerned, all "anti" movements spring from the rejection of the Commandments of Christ: "This is My Commandment—that you love one another as I have loved you." Or again: "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them." Our Lord understood how difficult it is to wipe out national and racial and religious prejudices; nevertheless He refused to soften His injunction of love. He went even further. In the midst of the hatreds surrounding Him, He proclaimed: "You have heard that it was said, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy.' But I tell you, love your enemies . . . pray for those who persecute you." To be pro-Christian does not mean to be anti-anybody; on the contrary, it is exactly the opposite doctrine.

God forbid that the American peo-

ple should ever cease to follow the moral code which instilled in their forefathers a sense of fraternity and a desire for righteous love for one another! God forbid that they abandon the commandments of love, and thus turn their backs on their own national charter! If they do, whence can come the inspiration to treat every man as an equal in the sight of God, or the moral energy sufficient to insure every man the rights that belong to him as a person, precious to society, precious to his Maker? Not until all our citizenry regains the concept of the inherent, spiritual dignity of every man will our intra-national hatreds be banished. This is the crux of the problem—as I see it—and the reason why hatred movements particularly challenge religious leaders.

EQUALITY OF ALL

We must in conscience wage battle against every philosophy that holds men to be economic or political or biological individuals only and denies them spiritual personality. All men are equal as spiritual persons and we must love all spiritual persons as equals. This is not to say that as individuals they are in every sense equal. Some are patently superior, judged by many norms. They are unequal in ability—unequal in achievement—unequal in health—unequal in opportunity—unequal in wisdom—unequal in virtue—unequal in wealth—unequal in happiness. But they are equal as

spiritual persons. Even whole races, nations and sects may excel in a certain respect, surpassing all others by their superiority in one or another regard. But when we look at those same individuals as persons, or reduce the group to an aggregate of persons, that is to say, creatures endowed with souls, all moving alike toward the single destiny of union with the Eternal God, their Father in Heaven, then we have perfect equality, and on the basis of it, we have the inescapable obligation to love each member of our common human race.

There are men who scoff at this truth; but their scorn does not affect the soundness of the truth nor indeed its practicability. This doctrine recognizes natural groupings, the superiority of some, the inferiority of others, the special interests of all. It may sometimes even seek to discourage the intermingling of groups, under certain conditions, as detrimental to society. The Jews, for instance, were once forbidden to inter-marry with the surrounding nations because of the gross idolatry that hemmed them in on every side. Other reasons make a similar policy, especially in religious matters, equally good even today. Again, in the social and economic field, one can understand that particular groups may have certain prior rights in a given locality and may resist the advent of other groups, provided the "resistance" be equitable and such as the other groups would rea-

sonably understand were the positions reversed.

We could multiply circumstances in which a group can be regarded as a group and treated as a group, but there can never be circumstances which permit a group to stand condemned by society for the individual faults or sins of its members, especially of a minority of its members. The reason why this group-condemnation, group-hatred, group discrimination is wrong has nothing to do with Tolerance; it is a question of simple Justice.

ULTERIOR MOTIVES

There is one further thing I think should be said once and for all about group-hatred as it usually manifests itself:—the group-hater finds himself in very questionable company, for most of the group hostility that is stirred up, especially in our cities, has beneath it a sinister motive of exploitation. Employers of cheap labor, holders of desirable jobs that might be threatened by competition, owners of slum properties—vested interests of every kind—these men are certainly not without ulterior motives when they raise a hue and cry against the Negro, the Catholic, or the Jew. And I make one further observation: these interests are certainly not without satisfaction and even complicity when they sit in silence while their spokesmen exploit or foster differences among the religious and racial groups of this city or elsewhere.

The Jews and the Catholics have centuries of persecution behind them in history; we have, I suppose, developed a technique in dealing with it. The problem of the Negroes is a much more serious one for the nation. Organized opinion among the Negroes considers that the United States as the chief exponent of democracy owes it to itself as well as to them to blot out this stain of racial discrimination. They know that they have been for generations loyal Americans, contributors in conspicuous degree to our economic success. Yet, all too often, they have looked in vain for justice from our political and economic agencies. We tell them that the solution to racial intolerance lies in religion; we tell them that Christianity teaches the brotherhood of all mankind in Christ, that this brotherhood is of all races, unconcerned with the color of one's skin. All that is perfectly true—and America accepts it in principle. But there must be what popular parlance calls "a practical follow-up."

RACE TOLERANCE

What if the oppressed and humiliated millions turn their back on Christianity, declaring that though it teaches the Fatherhood of God, the Christians act as if they did not believe the doctrine? What if these millions, in despair, turn to Communism, hearing its propagandists assure them feverishly that in Communism alone can they find equality? What if, in blind-

ness, they give to that foreign ideology the numbers it has not been able to attract from the various strata of whites? How far, then, would White Christians and Jews be responsible for the death-blow such a backing of Communism would give our institutions?

I can answer for the Catholic. When he fails to take a stand against race tolerance he is a slacker in the army of the Church Militant at a time when history's most crucial battle is being waged to determine whether the spiritual or the pagan conception of life will rule the world. Christ placed all this on a Supernatural basis. He knew that once men had seen the relationship of all men to God and to one another, then it would be easier to see the dignity of one's fellow-man. Only on a Supernatural basis can the great truth of the brotherhood of men come to fruition. Christ identified Himself with the poor, the lowly, and no Catholic can despise a fellow-man and remain a true follower of the Nazarene. The believer who considers the Negro on the basis of the color of his skin is at once untrue to his religion and blind to this great national problem.

There is no master race here in the United States, thanks be to God! God has not given to any race a monopoly of intelligence, character or patriotism. Our country has never pretended, in principle, that He did. But our lofty principles are being contradicted; and not all the challenge is

abroad. Our worst enemies are within. They are spiritual enemies; they attack our moral reserves and fortresses. So, the future of our nation—great though we are—will not be assured until we again make spiritual and moral principles, in a word religion, the vitalizing force of our lives.

From religion are distilled justice, charity and mercy; these are the world's greatest needs. We shall always have to struggle to preserve what we have won. But the struggle will be easy if we love one another; love our neighbor, and love him irrespective of race, creed or color.

Tolerance such as this is no less than justice. It spells no compromise with true Faith. Any devout Protestant, any believing Jew, will know how to paraphrase for himself these Catholic words:

Truth is truth, we cannot be tolerant of error

Right is right, we cannot hear willingly the claims of evil

Christ to me and to millions of others is the Light of the World,

We cannot be asked to walk in darkness,

But we can be kind and loving and merciful to all.



Tradition of Liberty

The genius of this nation, which is imbibed from its Catholic upbringing, was based on the Christian idea of the supreme importance of the individual; God made us "a little lower than the angels"; and He made us not for the glorification of state or race or nation or empire, but that we should singly and individually, as sons of our Eternal Father, attain unto eternal happiness with Him. It is this concentration on the sanctity of individual and personal liberty that is the keynote of our greatness. In all our long history we have kept that ideal before us; our fathers worked for it and fought for it; it has, indeed, meant "blood and sweat and tears." We have kept it so far; we must see that we do not lose it now.

This stubborn refusal to bow the knee to tyrants, this fierce resolve to live our lives according to our own conscience, this noble desire to see that others shall enjoy the like freedom—I will not call these Christian virtues, but I do say that they march with, and not against, the Christian way of life and are in accord with Christian morals.—*S. J. Gosling in PEOPLE AND FREEDOM, June, 1945.*

Teen-Agers and Dates

D. F. MILLER

*Reprinted from The LIGUORIAN**

PROBLEM: How long should teen-agers be permitted to stay out at night? Are parents justified in setting a time—say 12 o'clock—at which they must be home? Would it not be a serious sin of disobedience if, contrary to an express order, they stayed out an hour or two beyond the time they should be at home? These are questions we've been discussing among ourselves without much light being shed on them.

Solution: They are all good questions, and important ones. They signify the fact that somebody is thinking about these problems, which, in this era of excessive freedom for young people and positive neglect on the part of many parents, gives rise to hope for the future.

How long should teen-agers be permitted to stay out at night? Parents certainly have the right to set a deadline in this regard, and together with the right, something of an obligation. In exercising the right and fulfilling the obligation, they must use prudence and wisdom. For example, early teen-agers, i.e., from 13 to 16, should be dealt with firmly and inflexibly in this

regard. A time should be set and insisted on from the beginning of their going out evenings for entertainment. There should be no shilly-shallying or vagueness or indecision on the part of the parents; if fidelity is insisted on from the beginning, few difficulties will arise. It is parents who follow no set principles or norms from the beginning who meet with rebellion when they try to enforce a rule. With older teen-agers, i.e. 16-20, parents can become a bit more flexible. For example, when they are attending a party or social affair that is well-chaperoned, they can be given a little leeway about the time for leaving the party, with strict orders, however, that they must come straight home when they do leave.

There is an old-fashioned habit still practiced by some parents that can be recommended to all, despite the fact that it is often considered unnecessary and foolish by their own children. It is that of staying up at home and waiting for their children's return. Yes, there are plenty of objections available to it, such as the loss of sleep involved, etc., but all the objections are outweighed by its psychological and real

* Box A. Oconomowoc, Wisc., July, 1945

value. Too few parents realize how often their children are led into their first sins by reason of the double fact that nobody cares what they are doing when they come home from a party and that a quiet house with everybody in bed and sleeping makes a wonderful rendezvous for violent temptation. Many a young person gets home from a date at 12, according to orders, and then right at home succumbs to serious sin.

If parents have seriously insisted on a deadline to be made by their teenagers in returning home from dates and parties, certainly the latter would be guilty of a grave sin of disobedience if they were to disregard it. The great dangers involved make this a matter on which parents can bind seriously in obedience. We repeat, however, that prudence must be exercised; not the excessive and inconsiderate severity that would do more harm than good.



Thoughtlessness

Perhaps the saddest phrase of explanation is "I didn't think." We hurt so many people and pass by so many opportunities because *we don't think*. We do think but nearly all our thinking is about ME, ME, ME.

On the Fourth of July you were invited to come to Mass and pray for the security and holiness of your beloved ones in the Service. You were not there. *You didn't think*. You love them. Yes you do, not. Love is not getting or gabbing. Love is making sacrifices for those we love.

Again, your radio and your voice carry over to your neighbors. Of course you don't like a loud radio or your vociferous opinions of things. *You don't think*. Tune down your radio and lower your voice. Your neighbors will appreciate it.

You certainly don't wish to be classified as a gossip or a tale-bearer. But when people confide in you, you just blurt out all you know and hear and guess about your friends, hurting people, spreading ill-will and hate. Of course you didn't intend to do it. *You just didn't think*.

In conversation with your friends please remember nothing is lost by silence.—*From the Parish Bulletin, St. Margaret Mary Church, Midland Beach, Staten Island, N. Y.*

The Bishop as Peacemaker

MOST REV. SAMUEL A. STRITCH, D.D.

HERE this morning our thoughts turn to the office of a Bishop. We try to catch its meaning and find ourselves dwelling now on one phase of it and now on another. In fact, we confess to ourselves that our poor minds cannot do more than consider a single phase of the office of a Bishop at a time. May I, therefore, express to you my thoughts on a phase of the office of a Bishop which in these tragic times seems to me of utmost importance? For a few minutes I am going to ask you to think with me on the Bishop as a peacemaker in society.

As we look out on this war-torn world and see a hard-earned victory for our arms on the horizon, we wonder how out of the chaos of the after-war period men can bring order and that tranquility of order which is peace. One thing seems very certain to us and that is that peace will come with the realization of the ideal of true democracy everywhere in the world. True, there are those who say that democracy has seen its day and is worn out and inept. They would substitute for it ancient systems of political absolutism in one form or another. Events have given the lie to this assertion and men everywhere in their hearts are longing for the happiness in the enjoyment of the common good

Sermon delivered by the Archbishop of Chicago, on the occasion of the installation of the Most Rev. Eugene J. McGuinness, D.D., Co-adjutor Bishop of Oklahoma City and Tulsa, in the Cathedral of Our Lady of Perpetual Help, Oklahoma City, January 10, 1945.

which only a genuine democracy can achieve. In his Christmas message last year Pope Pius XII says:

If, then, we consider the extent and nature of the sacrifices demanded of all the citizens, especially in our day when the activity of the State is so vast and decisive, the democratic form of government appears to many as a postulate of nature imposed by reason itself.

We are among the many to whom the Holy Father refers. We are convinced that in the modern state, which exercises such wide authority in the social relations of the citizens, there can be no genuine peace and happiness where the ideals of democracy do not obtain. It is in the very war aims of our country to base the peace on democratic ideals and principles.

But in the confused thinking of the times, it is well for us to stop and take thought with ourselves on the nature of a true democracy and the truths

from which it comes. Basic in democratic institutions is the recognition of the person in every man and his human dignity. Man is a rational free being, responsible for his behavior and compelled by his very reason to seek the development and perfection of his innate powers. Thus man in his very nature is endowed with rights which are sacred and inviolable.

Now rights are rooted in law. In what law are these inalienable rights of man rooted? Can the pragmatist or the materialist answer this question? Rightly we say in the law of nature, that is, in that law which is written in human reason. But law demands an author, a legislator, and a judge and sanctions. There is nothing real in the law of nature unless we acknowledge God as its author and its judge and unless we recognize that it has sanctions from God.

If you talk about human freedoms, human rights, you must logically talk about God. Within me there is the command: Do right; avoid evil. There can be no real democracy without the fact of God and fact of moral obligations. These truths seem very clear to us in whose democratic traditions they are the constant, the absolute.

Now while a truth may be a thing of reason and knowable to man in the light of reason, it is a fact that many such truths are clearer to us in the light of Revelation, in God's direct manifestation of Himself to man,

especially in Christ Jesus, the Saviour. The Saviour underscored all His teaching with the truth of the moral accountability of man to God.

On the Cross He died for man, the sinner. As we kneel before that Cross, how clear to us is the natural truth of innate human rights or freedoms! And when I recall that there on the Cross He is the propitiation for my sins, how well I realize my human dignity! It is plain fact of history that the Christian Gospel ministers to man the very basic truths on which democracy rests, the fact of human freedoms rooted in the natural law of God, strengthened and ennobled by the Saviour.

SEEKS THE COMMON GOOD

But before we finish with the origins of democratic ideals, there is another fact or series of facts which we must recall to mind.

Man, endowed with rights and obligations under the moral law, by a very necessity of his nature, is social, that is, he must provide for his necessities and realize his perfection in social life with his fellowman. He is not a hermit, he is not an all-contained individual. The very moral law in which his freedoms are rooted governs his relations in society with his fellowman. Under the stress of a natural urge, man lives in political society. Therefore he must seek with

his fellowman the common good. Full well he knows that this common good is identified with his enjoyment of the free exercise of his innate rights and full well he knows that the moral law imposes on him obligations in political society or the State. Let us look again at the Cross. There the Saviour hangs with arms outstretched wide for the salvation of all men. He taught that "greater love than this no man hath that he give us his life for his friend." On the Cross we see how, in Christian truth, justice and charity demand that we not only accord to our fellowmen the enjoyment of their rights but that also we go beyond justice in devoting ourselves to helping them in social life to achieve happiness and peace. Again let me say that democratic ideals become potent social concepts when men kneel at the foot of the Cross!

Our Holy Father Pope Pius XII recently said the characteristics which should distinguish a citizen in a democracy are: The right to express his own views of the duties and sacrifices imposed on him by political authority, and the right to be heard before being compelled to obey. Succinctly here we have stated the truth that rational, intelligent participation of the citizen in government is at the very core of our democratic traditions. In a democracy there is organic, organizing unity. Every citizen senses his civic responsibility and seeks to make his contri-

bution to the good of the whole. This freedom is not conducive to chaos because it is constitutive of unity. We know full well that there must be an authority and after we have expressed our views we are ready to obey that authority when it acts within its own acknowledged competence. We choose by a free ballot our civil authorities and recognize in them the authority which our constitutions and laws give them. But we hold to our right to express ourselves in public affairs and we consider it our duty to make the fullest possible individual contribution to the common good.

PEOPLE VERSUS MASSES

Now in our times there has been revived in new garbs political systems which are the very antithesis of a democracy. Leaders by violence or deceit secure political control. Then by propaganda and force they impose their wills on the masses and sometimes seek to give the world the species of a democracy. But there is a difference between the masses in these countries and the people in a genuine democracy. These leaders recognize no innate human rights in the masses and reduce them to the status of a mere machine. Political life is not energized by the united action of the citizenry but the masses are moved by the dictator leadership. Under stress the masses fall into hysteria and frenzy and when deftly used by the dictator,

are a mere tool in his hands. In a democracy we speak of the people and in a dictatorship they talk of the masses. This system or theory comes from the philosophy of materialism and it significantly persecutes the Christian who, even in the catacombs, defended human rights against the Caesar on the Aventine.

And how am I going to connect this thought with the office of the Bishop? The Bishop is the witness of Christ among men. "You will be witnesses to Me," said the Saviour to the first Bishops. In witnessing Christ, the Bishop keeps alive among men the truths on which democracy must rest. Today he looks with tear-stained eyes at the enslavement of the masses in many lands, at the suffering which

godless dictatorships have inflicted on the world, at the dangers which imperil the establishment of a lasting peace when victory comes to our arms. He has no fear of genuine democracy; in fact, he is convinced that in the modern world it is the sole political form which can establish a good peace. He knows that democracy takes its inspiration from the Gospel of Christ and he realizes the weight of responsibility which his office, as a teacher of that Gospel, imposes on him. He is a peacemaker and today he knows that peace is inseparably connected with the establishment of genuine democracy where it does not obtain and with its preservation and development in countries which long have been its strongholds.



Chicago and Jaipur

The world-wide character of American Jesuit education was brought out recently by the appointment of Father James T. Hussey as Acting President of Loyola University in Chicago. Half-way around the world, his brother, Father William R. Hussey, is head of the new American Jesuit school of the Chicago province in Jaipur, India. A third brother, Father Martin J. Hussey, teaches at Loyola Academy. A fourth brother in the Army recently visited Father William in Jaipur.—*From The JESUIT MISSIONARY, May, 1945.*

The Wage Contract

*Reprinted from the NEW ZEALAND TABLET**

WHEN Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI stated that the wage contract was not essentially unjust, they by no means were endorsing the Capitalist wage system as such. In the very phraseology used by these great Popes, it is obvious that injustice has accompanied the wage contract, because they immediately proceed to define the essential justice and freedom that must exist if the wage contract is to be deemed truly human, and to condemn the proposition that it should be abolished because of unjust practices.

However, this does not prevent us from asserting, again with Leo XIII and Pius XI on our side, that wherever possible the wage contract should be modified by some form of partnership; because in most Capitalist wage contracts the wage earner is contracted out of his due share of the surplus which would not exist without his labor of body or mind. Catholic employers, therefore, ought to explore the possibilities of some form of cooperative partnership wherein Capital and Labor are equitably rewarded for their common contribution to the business.

We know that many employers reading such exhortations will often say: "Yes! all very well, but you don't realize the technical problems that beset us who have to ensure continuity of supplies, and observe a thousand and one factors which our employes do not even consider!"

Employers thus mistrust the idea of making employes co-partners, because many employes exhibit ignorance and irresponsibility about the welfare of the business. But does it not occur to such employers that both ignorance and irresponsibility are evils which can and ought to be remedied, and that they can and ought to play a leading part in helping their employes to understand such matters, and by giving them responsibilities, give them a reason for being responsible? It may sound banal to repeat such obvious good sense, but it is unfortunately true that many who rant about the irresponsibility of employes are least ready to give the workers responsible status in the business. Until they do so, the wage contract will remain a bitter bone of contention.

It is the folly of modern Capitalistic practice to preach to propertyless men and women Benjamin Franklin's injunctions, e. g., "Time is

* P. O. Box 353, Dunedin, N. Z., March 14, 1945

money," ignoring sarcastically the tragic fact that said money and its powers have been scientifically excluded from the grasp of working men and their families. It is the reproach of the Capitalistic System that it has impoverished the masses, savagely fought every attempt even to ameliorate their sorry state, and then made "laws" which designate poverty and destitution as a personal crime on the part of the sufferer.

And this self-same attitude towards the laboring masses still exists. To be without "visible means of support" is still a criminal offence in our society. Yet with no real control over the visible means of wealth in their daily work, thousands of people are dependent entirely upon an unstable wage system. The value of the money tokens they receive as wages is a vital factor, over which they have not the remotest control. Everything, in fact, forces them towards irresponsibility, and then a mock morality condemns them for becoming so! We are truly a foolish generation.



Victory in Europe

The problem in Europe as I see it, is to see that the people there are properly fed and kept reasonably warm during the coming winter and give them the essentials necessary for priming their industrial pumps.

It seems to me that our country must aid all countries for its own self-interest. The essential is to preserve the democratic way of life in western Europe. It was for that purpose that we provided lend-lease and all the other great contributions we have made.

We might as well be honest about what has happened in Europe. We have not won victory in Europe. We have only beaten the Germans. Our present enemies are cold and hunger. Unless we get clothing, fuel and something to eat to the people in Europe and assist them to re-establish themselves, the democratic way of life will be severely challenged.

Our own self-interest is to see that they get started on their own.—*Arthur Hays Sulzberger.*

People of the Pacific

By the Editors of *The SHIELD**

TODAY the scattered islands of the Pacific Ocean have become one of the great battlefields of the Second World War. But the Pacific's watery arena has always been a dangerous battleground. Hardy explorers, tempted by the lure of the sea, fought with the storms and then with savage peoples four hundred years ago to extend the empires of Europe.

It is one of the unsolved problems of history to trace the ancestry of the Oceanic peoples but the Pacific islands have become a melting-pot for people brown, black and yellow. And, for the last four hundred years, there have been white representatives of Europe and America, not always, sad to relate, reflecting credit upon their race, but sometimes working nobly and heroically for the betterment of the island people.

To any one who has read the stories of the Pacific war closely, it is a well known fact that the people of Oceania are partly black and partly brown. The black people are mostly in the southwestern area. They inhabit the now famous Solomons, New Guinea, New Britain, New Caledonia, the New Hebrides, the Fiji Islands, the Admiralty group and the Loyalty

group. The eastern half of New Guinea, under British rule, has commonly been included in the region specifically designated as Oceania, although the western half, being under Dutch control, is considered to be part of the East Indies. All of these islands together are called Melanesia (from the Greek word *melas*—"black").

The brown peoples are predominant in the more widely scattered islands to the northeast, which are classified under the general name of Polynesia, because, to the early explorers, it seemed that they were more numerous than the islands of the black people to the South, the name "Polynesia" coming from the Greek word *polus*—"many." The Polynesian islands include the Hawaiian group, the Ellice Islands, the Samoas, the Tonga, Cook, Marquesas and Society Islands and Midway. Also to be mentioned are two very small islands which, though they have not figured importantly in the news of the modern world, are spots of heroic significance in the mission history of Oceania; these are Wallis and the two islands of Futuna.

West of Polynesia and north of

* The Crusade Castle, Shattuck Ave., Cincinnati 26, Ohio, April, 1944

Melanesia are several groups of islands which have been the scene of bitter fighting in the Second World War. These include the Marianas, the Carolines, the Marshalls, and the Gilberts (of which Makin Island is one); Wake Island and Guam. These islands together are called Micronesia, because they are generally small—many of them mere coral atolls, the name "Micronesia" being derived from the Greek word *micro*—"small." The people of Micronesia are mostly related to the Polynesians, with some mixture from Asia.

The islands of the Pacific that are properly called Oceania are distributed over an area of almost 11,000,000 square miles, but the actual land extent, counting in the British half of New Guinea, is less than 150,000 square miles and the total population is approximately 2,000,000.

The Melanesians are Negroid, with skin that is dark brown or black. Because many of them dress their hair in a bushy, frizzled style, American soldiers have called them "fuzzy-wuzzies." The blacks of the Solomon Islands, however, converted by Bishop Thomas Wade and his Marist priests, are called "black Irish," because their devotedness to the missionaries and their Faith are comparable to the religious traditions of Ireland.

Though the Polynesians are brown-skinned, some scientists do not believe that they are related to the brown

people of southeast Asia and the East Indies, who are Malayan, but rather that they may be Caucasian in origin.

The geographic environment of the Oceanians has limited them to pursuits of agriculture and maritime occupations. They are expert fishermen and navigators. Some of their canoes are really ocean-going ships. Traditions of extensive exploration are numerous among them and they bear marks of authenticity. Thus the story of Hui Te Rangiora, who is said to have sailed, centuries before Christopher Columbus, in a double-decked canoe to the ice fields of the South Polar region.

The scattering of the Oceanians over many islands has made missionary travel a serious problem. Most missionaries have several islands under their care, requiring them to take to the sea when going from one parish to another. In fact, when going from one part to another of the same island, it has frequently been found easier to go by sea because of the absence of roads overland.

THE SETTING UP OF THE CROSS

Although the history of the Catholic missions in Oceania goes back to the sixteenth century, it was not until the 1800's that organized efforts were made to convert the Oceanic people. Pope Gregory XVI divided the islands of the Pacific into Eastern, Central and Western Oceania for pur-

poses of missionary administration. Today there are more than thirty missionary territories in Oceania—a sufficient proof of the effective work done by the apostles of the Church during the past century.

The Cross was set up by the early European explorers in various areas of the Pacific islands. Thus it is known that Miguel de Legasti set up the Cross in the islands of Micronesia in 1565, but no definite missionary establishment was made until 1668, when Father Luis Diego de Sanvitores headed a party that landed on Guam. Within five years Father de Sanvitores had schools established and had won respect of the people generally. But persecutions followed, in which Father de Sanvitores himself was martyred. Then the mission was renewed, only to be persecuted again. Ownership of the islands was transferred by Spain to Germany, and under the German régime Protestantism was introduced, to cause new conflicts. After the First World War, the Marianas, Carolines and Marshall Islands were taken from Germany and given as a mandate to Japan.

In the Melanesian Islands, the first setting up of the missionary cross was made in the Solomons in 1568, when Alvara Mendana de Neyra landed with four Franciscan Fathers. One of their stopping places was Guadalcanal. But two centuries passed before the

Church was established in the islands of the black people. Some of the islands had to be rediscovered as their location was forgotten by the geographers of the time.

Among the Polynesians, there is record of the baptism of two Hawaiian chiefs in the year 1819 by the Catholic chaplain of a French ship, but this priest returned to France, and it was eight years before another came. Meanwhile, Protestant missionaries had appeared, and the Catholic missionaries—priests of the Congregation of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary—who came in 1827, were expelled. In 1839, the French government threatened to use force unless equal rights were granted to Catholics in Hawaii. From the establishment then made, the Faith spread to the Marquesas, Cook and Society Islands.

COURAGE AND MARTYRDOM

Perhaps Divine Providence intended the islands of the Pacific to teach certain lessons to the modern Christian world. One of these, most obviously, is the power of the Christian Gospel to turn savages into saints. Outstanding is the example of the two small islands of Futuna and their neighbor, Wallis. When Father Peter Chanel arrived there in 1838, he found a people whose cruelty was notorious. They had given up cannibalism only a few years before, not for humanitarian

reasons, but simply because the practice threatened to leave them without a sufficient number of warriors. But even yet, it was a common practice to strangle baby children and to bury enemies alive.

Father Chanel was not slow to appreciate the difficulties of his apostolate. He summed up his plan in these few words spoken to the Marist Brother who was his helper: "In a mission so difficult as ours, it is necessary that we become saints." And so, practicing kindness to everyone, Father Chanel first won the love of the children and then the confidence of their parents. Even the chief Maligi, who had eaten one of his own children, was won over.

It is true that Father Chanel was martyred later, but this tragedy was the result of the pride of the warrior chief Niuliki, who persecuted the Christians to show his own supreme power. But from Niuliki all dictators may learn a lesson, for though Father Chanel was violently removed from the scene of his labors, the seed of Christian Faith which he had planted continued to grow, and today the 6,000 people of the Islands of Futuna and Wallis are one hundred per cent Catholic.

Martyrdom was not the fate of all the missionaries. Others, like Father Bataillon, won over the fierce warriors by the sheer force of their courage. Father Bataillon, on one occa-

sion, when war was declared against a Christian tribe by King Lavelua, rallied his people around a crucifix and stood them in solid formation, with himself at the head, facing the attacking force. No arrows were shot and no spears were thrown, but only the voice of Father Bataillon was raised, as he shouted: "May God arise and may his enemies be dispersed!" King Lavelua and his men were struck with fear and turned away in retreat.

There were, of course, martyrs of other sorts among the missionaries of Oceania. The life of the great Father Damien de Veuster is a classic example of the martyrdom to duty. The story of his dedication to the lepers of Molokai is well known. It is a story of such heroic achievement that books would be required for the telling. It is important to remember, however, that Father Damien did not pass his time exclusively attending the sick, great as that task was; but, in addition, he acted as morale officer and sanitation director for the whole island colony. One of his hardest tasks was to stop the illicit manufacture of liquor for sale to the lepers.

The tradition of heroism established by the pioneer missionaries has been carried on by the present-day apostles in Oceania. The Marists in the Solomon Islands—bishops, priests and Sisters—have won world-wide fame by their plucky persistence in spite of the

Japanese invasion. The invaders in many instances established themselves in mission centers, so that their expulsion meant the destruction of mission buildings. Bishop Thomas Wade, Vicar Apostolic of the North Solomons, and first member of the Catholic Students' Mission Crusade to be made a bishop, was forced to live for months in hiding. Father Arthur Duhamel, also a Marist and a former Crusader, was murdered by Japanese soldiers, along with a French priest and two French Marist Sisters.

MODERN APOSTLES IN OCEANIA

Deserving of mention for their courage are all the missionaries who have been at work in the regions of the Pacific into which the war has entered. Among the Americans are members of the secular clergy and the following missionary societies and religious orders of men: Capuchins (Detroit); Christian Brothers (New York); Society of the Divine Word (Techy, Ill.); Jesuits (New York); Marianists (Dayton, O.); Marists (Boston and Washington); Maryknoll Missioners (Maryknoll, N. Y.); Congregation of the Sacred Hearts (Washington).

American societies and orders of women in Oceania include these: Franciscan Missionaries of Mary (North Providence, R. I.); Third Franciscan Order, Minor Conventuals (Syracuse, N. Y.); Missionary Sis-

ters Servants of the Holy Ghost (Techy, Ill.); Sisters of St. Joseph of Orange (Orange, Calif.); Marist Sisters (Bedford, Mass.); Maryknoll Sisters (Maryknoll, N. Y.); Missionary Sisters of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus (Reading, Pa.).

Other religious from Europe have been equally courageous, though many, especially those from Holland, have been deprived of all hope—at least for the present—of receiving any help from their homeland. For the Americans there is the definite prospect of rehabilitation as soon as the war abates, because funds are already being raised for this purpose in the United States.

Missionary statistics for Oceania are necessarily in a disordered state, but here are some figures which indicate the flourishing conditions of the missions at the outbreak of the war. These statistics, taken from various sources, are the latest that could be obtained:

	<i>Total Population</i>	<i>Catholic Population</i>
New Caledonia..	50,000	32,000
Fiji	200,000	17,000
Samoa	50,000	12,500
Guam	20,000	19,500
North Solomons.	60,000	30,000
South Solomons..	80,000	8,000
Carolines	31,000	} 20,500
Marshalls	10,000	
Marianas	44,000	
Marquesas	2,300	2,000

Hawaii	380,000	113,000
Wallis & Futuna	6,000	6,000

The following general statistics of Oceania were compiled for *Guida delle Missioni Cattoliche*, a publication having the authority of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide, for the year 1933. While, doubtless, many of these figures have been changed, they are useful at least for showing the progress which had been achieved in one hundred years of missionary effort in a practically virgin field:

Population of all Oceania .	2,000,000
Catholic Population	425,000
Priests, foreign	321
Priests, native	24
Brothers, foreign	237
Brothers, native	34
Sisters, foreign	565
Sisters, native	231
Catechists	2,083
School-teachers	585
Catholic schools	802
Pupils in schools	33,261



Freedom of Women

Emancipation of women does not mean reducing her to the status of a day laborer. By nature the woman depends on the man for companionship, for protection, for support. Conversely the man depends on the woman for inspiration and the charm of home life.

God intended that the man provide for the home, the woman keep it and both share it with each other and their family. Divine Wisdom planned wisely. Beware of interference.—
From The SOUTHERN CROSS, San Diego, July 6, 1945.

Peacetime Conscription

BY THE EDITORS

*Reprinted from The WANDERER**

OPPPOSITION which the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States expressed last November to the enactment at this time of a House compulsory peacetime draft was reiterated last week before the Committee on Postwar Military Policy.

The Bishops' stand was set forth in a letter by the Very Rev. Msgr. Howard J. Carroll, General Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, to Representative Clifton A. Woodrum of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee.

I have been directed to inform you that the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of the United States, at a meeting held in November, 1944, unanimously passed a resolution opposing the immediate passage of peacetime compulsory military training legislation. Their action was based on the following considerations:

That a matter so important should await decision until the end of the war when it can be known what the international situation will be;

That those now serving in the Army and Navy should be given an opportunity to express their views on this measure before it is enacted;

That military requirements until the end of the war can be met by the extension of the Selective Service Act.

The same committee sessions which heard Monsignor Carroll's letter also heard representatives of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the Rabbinical Assembly of America, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the Evangelical and Reformed Church oppose enactment of compulsory military training legislation now.

Speaking for the Federal Council of Churches, Dr. Herbert J. Burghstahler, president of Ohio Wesleyan University, said that "the precise nature or strength of armaments that may be required cannot be foreseen now," and that those for whom he spoke felt that "our Nation should not at this time take any action which would reverse our historic policy with respect to compulsory military training."

A. Whitney, assistant general counsel of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, said the passage of the bill now would be an open invitation to other countries to prepare for war. "There is something pitifully ironical," he said, "about a nation vigorously preparing for the next war and

delaying the problems of peace while fighting a war to destroy militarism and to establish enduring world peace."

Dr. Robert Gordis, president of the Rabbinical Assembly, said action now on the proposed legislation would be unwise and even dangerous.

Huber F. Klemme, Cleveland, spoke in opposition as representative of the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Josephus Daniels, World War I Secretary of the Navy, condemned the proposed peacetime draft as an attempt to "hitlerize America." "The apparent sentiment for departing from American tradition does not exist in the hinterland of America . . ." he asserted. "Most of it is pumped up. Outside of Washington and official and military circles there is little demand for this radical departure from a system of government that has been

our sound foundation in all our history."

"The propaganda," he added, for compulsory military service for American youth is based upon three false premises:

1. Fear, and I hold with Franklin Roosevelt that "fear is the only thing to fear," as I read or listen to the pleas to hitlerize America, and see how the advocates of compulsion tremble, I am reminded of the old nursery rhyme: "Run, Little Fear, or Big Fear will get you."

2. Cynicism. The disbelief in the belief of our civilization to rise out of savagery and so order the affairs of a civilized age as to make war an anachronism. This unbelief is based on the silly credo: "There have always been wars and there always will be wars."

3. Imperialism. The desire that Uncle Sam shall abandon democracy, the right of all men to govern themselves, and follow the example of the Israelites of old, who, tired of God's guidance, wished a king so they would be like neighbor nations that lived by the sword.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: John LaFarge EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: William H. Dodd, Henry Watts

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York, N. Y.

PUBLISHER: Gerald C. Treacy BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.